# MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI:

# A Mahatma

# or

# A Papatma?

Dr. Radhasyam Brahmachari

# MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI :

*A Mahatma or A Papatma?*

**Dr Radhasyam Brahmachari**

চাহিনা
প্রকাশনী

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi : A Mahatma or A Papatma
*By* Dr. Radhasyam Brahmachari

Price : Rupees Twenty Only

*Published By*
Tuhina Prakashani
12C, Bankim Chatterjee Street
Kolkata-700073
Phone : 2306-4306

First Edition : 2013

*Printed at*
Mahamaya Press & Binding
23, Madan Mitra Lane
Kolkata-700006

Price : 20.00 (Rupees Twenty Only)

# CONTENTS


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 01 | Gandhi's Quack Doctrine of Nonviolence is Contrary to Hindu Heritage | 5 |
| 02 | Gandhi borrowed non-violence creed from Western Authors | 9 |
| 03 | Historical Origins of Nonviolence and Vegetarianism in India | 14 |
| 04 | Gandhi's Loyalty to the British Crown | 18 |
| 05 | Gandhi was a British Agent and brought from South Africa by the British to Sabotage India's Freedom Movement | 24 |
| 06 | Gandhi's Muslim Appeasement | 30 |
| 07 | More on Gandhi's Muslim Appeasement | 37 |
| 08 | Gandhi and Jihad by the Moplahs in Kerala | 40 |
| 09 | Gandhi's Experiments with Celibacy | 43 |
| | Appendix I Nathuram Godse – Why I killed Gandhi | 48 |
| | Appendix II Gandhi did not say Hey Ram while dying | 53 |
| | Appendix III Gandhi did not get the Nobel Peace Prize | 53 |
| | Appendix IV Gandhi Index | 53 |

coercion and torture by the foreign aggressors like a lamb, in the name of nonviolence, can hardly earn any respect from others.

These ardent followers of nonviolence must have gone through our history, but have they been able to find a single instance where our forefathers adopted nonviolence as a weapon to combat foreign intruders? They resisted the barbarian Alexander by application of force. Raja Vikramaditya drove the Sakas out of our motherland with the power of sword. Our ancestors in western India repulsed the barbaric Muslim invaders for a long period of nearly 500 years, by force alone. Later on Rana Pratap, Maharana Sangram Singh, Vikramaditya Hemraj, Raja Shivaji, Guru Govind Singh and Raja Ranjit Singh tried to drive the foreign Muslim ruler out of this holy land with the power of sword. After arriving in Srilanka, Lord Ram did not opt for a Satyagraha or for a fast unto death to recover Sita. Lord Krishna sided with the Pandavas to suppress the wicked and lawless Kauravas, in the battle field of Kurukshetra, with the application of force alone. So, the people, who are trying to project and establish their creed of nonviolence as a great Hindu heritage, are either ignorant of true heritage of the Hindus, or are motivated.

A real Hindu should never cause slightest harm, not only to a man, but also to living plants and animals, but he is to deal with an aggressor or an evil doer severely. The real devotee of Lord Krishna is one who punishes the evildoers with strong hands, but ready to sacrifice his life to protect innocent, weak and virtuous ones. The real devotee of Lord Ram is one who is a skilled warrior and can mercilessly kill enemies in the battle-field. But, out of utmost stupidity, we are mistaking a man, who sings Ramdhun and preaches nonviolence, as a great devotee of Lord Ram. The Sanatan Hindu dharma is not a Dharma for the cowards. The Fundamental teaching of the Vedas is "Your body dies, but not your soul, because your soul is eternal" and hence be "abhih", or fearless. Furthermore, every Hindu god or goddess carry weapons for killing or annihilating miscreants en masse.

It is said that, Hindu Dharma and Hindu Culture rests on four pillars, namely Ganga, Gayatri, Gita and Govinda and every Hindu admits that Gita or more specifically, Srimadghavadgita contains the nectar of Hindu Dharma. In Gita, Lord Sri Krishna says that He incarnates Himself to protect the good and law abiding people and destroy the evildoers and miscreants en-masse as and when it becomes necessary. In the battle field of Kurnkshetea, when Arjun expressed his unwillingness

to fight with his own people, Lord Krishna did not admire his attitude and advise him to remain nonviolent. On the contrary, He rebuked Arjun and said, "Play not the eunuch, O Partha, it does not befit you, give up this vile faintheartedness and arise, O destroyer of the foe". (II.3). So, it becomes evident that the said creed of nonviolence is contrary to the teachings of Gita, and hence contrary to Hindu Dharma and tradition.

It is true that. Once upon a time this holy land rose to prominence in every sphere of life and attained supreme wisdom in every branch of knowledge by following the path of Rajomaya Karmayoga of Gita, and there is no doubt that it has turned into a land of cowardice and Tamasic people, or in other words, a land of slaves and clerks, by forgetting the said teachings of Gita. Blessed Lord also said, "(O Arjun), muse upon me always, and be always ready go to war as well" (VIII.7), and we fools are considering only the first part of the Lord's advice, i.e. "muse upon me always" as dharma and have dropped the other part, "go to war". In this way, people of this great nation abandoned weapon and foreign invaders began to come like wave after wave, subjugated us and ruled over us for centuries after centuries.

In fact, it took several thousand years for the said downfall to take place. During the entire mediaeval period that lasted for nearly 4000 years, we had great religious teachers like Gautam Buddha. Sankaracharya, Ramanuja, Madhvacharya and so on, but none of them did uphold the teachings of Gita. Out of the four purusharthas, or duties and aspirations of individual, i.e. Dharma. Artha, Kama and Moksha, these teachers put emphasis only upon Moksha or the spirituasl part and neglected Dharma, Artha and Kama or the worldly aspirations of life.

There is no doubt that Sankaracharya, believed to be an incarnation of Lord Shiva, came to save the Hindu Dharma, with the help of his Advaitabada and Bhaktibada. But still he did not uphold the Niskama Karmayoga of Gita, but on the contrary, said "Though selfless work is capable of purifying one's heart, it cannot raise one to the stage of 'Realisation of the Self'. One can achieve that highest goal only through pursuit of knowledge, while performance of crores of actions (karma) can do nothing" (Vivekachudamani-11).

So, throughout the entire middle age, none of our religious teachers echoed the teachings Gita, upholding the superiority of karma or selfless work; no one tried to inspire our people by the teachings of Gita, such as, **"Do you the work that is prescribed for you,**

**for to do work is better than to do no work at all"** (III. 8.); or **"You have the right in performing your duties alone, but not to claim their fruits"** (II.47); or **"You ought to engage yourself in action for the good of this world"** (III.20) and so on. On the contrary, they listened from our leaders. **"Karmana badhyate janturvidya ca vimucyate"** or, one can overcome this world only through pursuit of knowledge, whereas, by duty and action (karma) he gets himself entangled to this phenomenal world; or, **"Dandagrahanamatrena naro narayana bhavet"**- an individual instantly become Narayana (God) by accepting asceticism.

It is to be pointed out here that, in Gita, Lord Krishna had cautioned wise people not to confuse common people, who are engaged in action, even though for immediate personal gain, by bringing the wisdom of scriptures to them. Lord also cautioned people against renunciation of work and submission to asceticism and said, **"There is hardly any necessity for me to engage myself into action, as I am the Lord of this universe. But still, I do not withdraw Myself from my duties. If I do so, common people, by following me would withdraw themselves from duty and action and hence the entire creation would perish"** (III.24).

But, unfortunately, the apprehension of the Lord came true. By the adverse teachings of our religious leaders, nothing but escapism could gain popularity among the people and they started getting themselves detached from duty and action (karma) by accepting asceticism in large numbers. As a result, the great ideal of karma of Gita began to abolish and, instead, number of parasitic, lazy, utterly unfit and escapist sanyasins began to swell very rapidly. In this way, "Tamas" took the place of "Rajas", or action, and gradually, this great nation of the Hindus turned into a land of unmanly, timid and coward people.

## GANDHI BORROWED HIS NON-VIOLENT CREED FROM WESTERN AUTHORS :

But it is interesting to note that the creed of nonviolence, that gained popularity during the British-Raj, did not derive its inspiration from the above mentioned trend of renunciation of work and accepting asceticism that became prevalent in India under the influence of mainly Buddhism. In this regard, Historian Dr. A. C. Roy writes, "In 1849, the American poet Henry David Thoreau made use of the word 'Civil Disobedience' for the first time in a public meeting. He also wrote some assays on the same subject. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was very much influenced by the above mentioned idea and later on, he made a practical application of 'Civil disobedience' in South Africa, for the first time in history". He also writes, "Gandhiji got a new guideline from the writings of Ruskin and Tolstoy- especially from 'Unto the Last' by Ruskin and from 'Kingdom of God' by Tolstoy and accepted nonviolence as a political ideology as well as strategy".

It has been mentioned earlier that Hindu Dharma never prescribed nonviolence as a strategy to combat a brute force or foreign aggressors and in this matter, the voice of Gitâ is 'very clear. So, to establish his new creed of nonviolence, borrowed from the foreigners, Gandhi had no other alternative but to misinterpret Gitâ and other Hindu scriptures. And hence he, in the introduction of his ' *Anâshaktiyoga*, his commentary on Gitâ, writes, **"As a matter of fact, Gitâ describes the internal war, which is going on in every human heart (between good and evil), in the allegory of a physical war, to make it easily understandable".**

It should be pointed out here that Gitâ is not an isolated work, but only a tiny part of the epic Mahabharata. So if anyone says that Gitâ is mythical, at the next moment he will have to say that, Mahabharata is nothing but poet's fancy. So in the introduction of his

*Gitâ Bodha*, another commentary on Gita, Gandhi writes, **"Generally Mahabharata is taken to be a historical work. But in my opinion, it is not so. I cannot say that the Ramayana and the Mahabharata are historical works. Simply, they are religious works. If you are still inclined to treat them as historical work, then I should say that, they are nothing but the history of the Self (Âtma). They do not contain what actually happened thousands and thousands of years ago. On the contrary, they are the reflections of what is happening today in every soul".**

However, one should not get frightened by the above utterances as it is true that, one has to import ten bad arguments in order to establish a bad idea (i.e. the quack doctrine of non-violence). So in the next paragraph, Gandhiji writes, **"Krishna of Gitâ is the embodiment of pure and divine knowledge, but without having any physical existence. By this, the Avatar Krishna is not denied at all, but only it is said that, He is mythical-the concept of a perfect incarnate was attributed to him later on".** But according to Hindu theology, an Avatâra or an Incarnation of God means the appearance of the Absolute Being, Brahma in human flesh and blood. So accepting Lord Krishna as an Avatâra or Incarnation of god and at the same time declaring Him Mythical is self contradictory, and reflects the profound ignorance of Gandhi about Hindu Dharma and its basic concepts.

In the present context, it would be relevant to mention that the world renowned archaeologist S R Rao conducted several marine archaeological excavations in Dwaraka from 1984 to 1992, and discovered the old city of Dwaraka, the capital of Lord Krishna's empire. He also proved conclusively the city he discovered was founded by Lord Krishna as the capital of His Empire. So, the question naturally arises – If Dwaraka is a reality, how can Krishna be mythical? On the contrary, the discovery of Dwaraka by S R Rao has conclusively proved that Lord Krishna was a historical personality.

So, there is no doubt that most of the Hindus would refuse to accept the above view of Gandhi regarding the *Râmâyana* and the *Mahâbhârata* and it would be highly amusing to every Hindu that, throughout Gitâ, Lord Krishna was inspiring Arjuna to fight a mental war. It has been mentioned earlier that Gandhi derived his first inspiration for nonviolence from the works of some foreign writers and it reflects that he, perhaps, did not know that from time immemorial, Hindus held very high esteem

for nonviolence or ahimsa. It was also not possible for him that, according to Hindu theology, ahimsâ is the first lesson for those who aspire to attain highest spiritual state or Moksha.

It should be mentioned here that the eight fundamental virtues of *Astânga Pâtanjal Yoga* are yama, niyama, âsana, prânâyâma, pratyâhâra, dhyâna and Samâdhi. The very first virtue, i.e. yama, contains observance of five rites, namely ahimsâ (non-violence), satya (truthfulness), asteya (non-stealing), brahmacharya (celibacy) and aparigraha (stay away from worldly interests). So, it becomes evident that the first lesson of Indian Yoga is ahimsâ. What is the nature of this ahimsâ of the Hindus? The *Yogakârikâ*, in this regard, says,

***Kâyena manasâ bâcâ prânipidanvarjanam*** [1]
***Mulam yat sarvvadharmânâm sâ ahimsâ yogibhirmatâ*** [2]

Or, "Abstaining from hurting any living being by means of body, mind and speech is known as ahimsa, which is the fundamental and basis of all spiritualism and is fit for the yogis". When a yogi, even at the risk of his life, or at the risk of incurable diseases, stays firm in observance of ahimsâ, it can be said that the yogi has attained the highest fulfillment in observing the rite of ahimsa. What then happens? *Yogakârikâ* says,

***Ahimsâyâh pratisthâyâm yoginah sannidhau tadâ*** [1]
***Jantavah sâsvatam variam tyâjeyustatprabhâvât*** [2]

Or, "When a yogi attains success (siddhi) in observing ahimsâ, even ferocious animals in the forest, being overwhelmed by the influence of the yogi, forsake their cruelty".

According 'Advaita Vedânla' ***Sarvam khalvidam Brahma***, or "everything in this universe, visible or invisible, is the same cosmic Self, Brahma, appearing in different forms"; and ***Aham Brahmâsmi***, and "myself is also that cosmic self, Brahma". By these two propositions all differences, not only among human beings, but also between any two objects of universe, instantly vanishes. So hurting anybody means nothing but hurting himself, and hence one, who has attained realization, cannot posses in his heart slightest amount of himsâ (i.e. violence, cruelty, envy, jealousy etc). So, Bhagavân Shri Krishna, in *Bhâgavadgita*, says, ***"nirvaira sarvabhuteshu yah sa mameti pândava"***, or "such a yogi cannot possess minutest hostility or enmity to anybody and, O Arjuna, such a yogi certainly obtains me" (XI:55).

Like Christianity or Islam, Sanâtana Hindu Dharma does not prescribe same religious ritual for all sections of the people. This

Dharma has not been preached by a single individual but evolved from the society and hence it is more nearer to a tradition of culture than a religion as such. Here Dharma for a *Brâhmana* is not the same that has been prescribed for a *Kshatriya*, and Dharma for a *Kshatriya* is not the same that is reserved for a *Vaisya* and so on. Here, carrying out one's duty, assigned to him according to his assigned position in the society, is one's Dharma. Here, *ahimsâ* or nonviolence has been assigned as a Dharma for the hermits and yogis; while the task to protect the virtuous and to protect the sovereignty of the country has been assigned as the Dharma for the *Kshatriya*. An individual, who protects others from *kshata* (or any kind of injury), is a *Kshatriya*. So, according to Hindu Dharma, it would be an adharma for a *Kshatriya*, if he observes nonviolence with a foreign invader. Nay, such an act by a Kshatriya, would not only be an Adharma (immoral) but a criminal offence. Such a cowardice act of a *Kshatriya* has always been repudiated in Hindu tradition.

In the *Mahâbhârata*, Bhisma explains Dharma to Yudhisthira like this, ***"Yasmin yathâ varate yo manusyastasminstathâ vartitavyam sa dharma"***, or "You should behave with anyone according to his behaviour to you and that is dharma". Prahlada, the most esteemed devotee of Lord Visnu, is advising his grandson, ***"Na sreyam satatam tejo na nityam sreyasi ksamâ"*** or "It is not always wise to show vigour and similarly forgiveness is also not always good. Wise men say that one should act according to the demand of the situation". Valorous queen Vidulâ rebuked her son, who *was* afraid of facing an army of aggressors, and said,

***Uttistha he kâpurusa mâ svapsih satrunirjitah [2]***
***Ksamâvanniramaryâsca naiva stri na punah pumân [2]***

- or. "O unmanly coward, don't sleep anymore and arise. Those who do not become wrathful even being trampled by the enemy and do not try to avenge upon, are neither men nor women".

So, it becomes evident from the above discussions that according to the Hindu scriptures, ahimsa or nonviolence is the first step of spiritual pursuits and hence has been kept aside for sages and yogis, who have renounced domestic life for highest spiritual attainment. Whereas for common people, the path of selfless work and *bhaki* (devotion) has been kept open. It has been mentioned above that the observable rituals that come under the prescription of *"yama"* contains *brahmacharya* (celibacy), which cannot be a compulsory ritual for

common people. And at the same time, *vyadhas*, *kiratas* and *nisadas*, who earn their living by hunting animals and selling their flesh, nonviolence cannot be and observable rite for them.

The Jainas are renowned for their non-violence and they do not drink water unless it has been sieved by a fine cloth. This is not for preventing disease but for the sake of saving the lives of invisible insects that might be present in water. The Jaina ascetics normally cover the lower part of their face with a piece of white linen, and it is also for saving the lives of invisible airborne insects or microbes.

These Jainas have divided violence (himsa) into four categories, (i) accidental. (2) for earning a livelihood (3) for saving one's life and (4) intentional. No one has any control over accidental violence, as one may trample and crush an insect in the darkness of night, unintentionally. Committing intentional violence is one of the gravest sins in Jaina theology. Even such nonviolent Jainas have declared violance of second and third category lawful. So, these nonviolent Jainas have to act violently against aggressors and foreign invaders. And, perhaps, due to this reason, Gandhi could not accept nonviolence, neither of the Hindus nor of the Jains, and had to borrow a nonsensical or quack creed of non-violence from the foreigners.

## HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF NONVIOLENCE AND VEGETARIANISM IN INDIA :

In the early days of human civilization, people earned their living either by food gathering or by hunting and later on they raised themselves to the pastoral stage through domestication of animals. Up to this stage of civilization, killing of animals was a daily routine matter and meat was the principle food item, and hence nonviolence and vegetarianism was totally unknown. Then, with advent agriculture, men become less and less dependent or animal flesh and in this regard, the position of India was unique. There are sufficient evidence that India went agricultural even before the age of Rigveda and hence Indian community was the first in the world to raise themselves from pastoral to the agricultural stage of human civilization. And there are sufficient reasons to believe that when India was adapted to agriculture, in most of the other parts of the world, people were nomadic as they were either in the food gathering or in the pastoral stage. This could happen as India had abundant fertile land and sufficient monsoon rain.

In this context, one may look at Arabia. Due to semi-desert nature of land and paucity or rain, Arabian society, still today, is leading a pastoral life. This is the reason why nonviolence and vegetarianism is unknown in Arabia. There is another evidence that endorse pastoral life-style in Arabia even today. The people of Arabia, due to their pastoral life-style, are being able to manage their daily life by counting their days and months following the lunar Calendar Hijri. On the other hand, adoption of a solar calendar is *a* must for an agricultural society, as farming is intimately connected with the annual movement of sun and the subsequent changes of seasons. This is the reason why the National Calendar of Islamic State of Bangladesh is not Hijri, but the Bengali solar calendar, as the Bangladeshi society is agricultural.

Due to the progress of agriculture in India, people became less dependent on animal meat and, as a consequence, sacrificial slaughter

*of* animals, as a Vedic rite, became less and less popular. People began to realize that killing animals, as religious sacrifices were a mere wastage, whereas their protection as beasts of burden was beneficial for agricultural.

During the time of Buddha and Mahavir, a movement in this direction gained much momentum, especially in eastern India where slaughter of animals was almost totally stopped as a process or observance of nonviolence. But the said movement could not gain much popularity in western India, where animal sacrifice continued, and notions like, "Vaidiki himsa himsa na bhavati" (violence for observing Vedic rites is no violence al all), or **"Tasmin yajne vadhah avadhah"** (killing animals for Vedic offering is not killing at all) were continued.

So, it becomes evident that nonviolence in India had its origin in agriculture and particularly in abundance of agricultural produce due to fertile land and adequate rainfall. As a matter fact, agriculture was a milestone in the history of human civilization. Firstly, it terminated the nomadic and pastoral lifestyle and provided man with permanent settlements, which in turn led to the formation of states and governments with well-defined constitutions and judiciaries. Secondly, with the progress of farming, a section of people was able to detach them from hard day-to-day labour for earning a living and devote their time on pursuit of knowledge and other cultural activities. So, it can safely be said that, agriculture was womb of modern human civilization.

In India, this process began quite a long ago and helped her to emerge as the oldest as well as the richest civilization on earth. In fact, this enabled Hindu thinkers and seekers to spend so much time to devote themselves in very intricate as well as subtle philosophical thoughts, while people in the rest of the world used to eat raw meat and cover themselves with hides. There is no doubt that due this reason, the highest human virtue, nonviolence, could originate in the highly civilized India, as smile is a unique faculty of highly developed mammal, or human beings.

Meanwhile more than two thousand years have passed. Foreign Muslim invaders ruled this country for nearly 700 year and then came the Europeans, especially the British. They mercilessly destroyed the age old cotton textile and other superb industries and reduced this country into a large as well as profitable market for the British finished goods. On the other hand, they decided to get the complex and hazardous task of collecting land revenue by the local natives and hence

created a new class of zamindars or landlords in the style of European feudalism. Local merchants or benias, being deprived of their traditional trade and industry, turned at once into zamindars and they thus took the responsibility of collecting land revenue for the British.

According to the Permanent Settlement of Bengal in 1793, these Zamindars could retain 11 percent of the collected revenue and had to deposit 89 per cent to the British Treasury. As there was no highest limit of revenue fixed by the authorities, these zamindars began to extort money, by whatever means they could, from the poor peasants, to please their masters. British, on the other hand, went on rewarding these loyal zamindars with the titles like Raja, Rai Bahadur and so on. Historians agree that without moral as well as financial support from these loyal zamindars, particularly of Bengal, it would not have been possible for the British to suppress the revolt of 1857.

Beside this loyal zamindars class, another class of people, both rich and loyal, originated at that time and that was the new capitalist class. These new capitalists accumulated wealth simply by their British connection - by serving the British as brokers, middlemen, contractors and so on. Nuseranji Tata came to Bombay, just after the birth of the city, leaving his ancestral home at Surat and started his life as a supplier for the British East India Company. Later on, during the Abyssinian war, he could bag the contract of supplying drinking water for the British army fighting in the distant country, and thus earned a good fortune. Then he secured the contract for supplying raw cotton to England. Fortunately, at that time the supply of American cotton was severely hampered due to the civil war in America and hence both demand and price of Indian cotton increased enormously and this helped Nuseranji to earn a good fortune. Then he purchased a second hand cotton spinning and weaving mill, the Empress Mill, at Nagpur and thus he laid the foundation stone of today's Tata Group of Industries.

Nilmoni Tagore of the famous Tagore family of Calcutta came to the city, leaving his ancestral home in East Bengal, to serve the British. Later on, his grandson Dwarakanath Tagore amassed colossal wealth by various business activities, in partnership with the British, like coal mining, sugar milling, publishing newspaper and so on. As a reward of his unquestionable loyalty to the British, he was awarded the title of Prince. There is no doubt that Rabindranath Tagore composed his entire lot of dance dramas and staged them to entertain the European officials invited to their Jorasanko house on various occasions.

The fame of the Tagore family rose to such a height that the Crown Price of Sweden, during his visit to the city in early 20th century, preferred to put up with the Tagore family and during his stay, he had the opportunity to go through the English translation of Gitanjali which, later on, earned the Nobel Prize for the poet. Many apprehend that the song 'Jana gana mana', which is now the National Anthem of free India, was written by the poet to welcome the Prince of Wales, during his visit to India in 1921. It also seems perplexing to many, why the poet and his family preferred to use the corrupt word Tagore as surname, instead of the original word Thakur.

This explains why it was not possible for these two above mentioned classes to play anti-British even to the slightest extent and, as a matter of fact, they were strongly in favour of British rule in India for their own benefit. That is why, these people never supported any movement whatsoever, for gaining freedom from the British but, on the contrary, tried to sabotage all such efforts. This became evident when, on 17th November 1921, the entire country observed general strike on the advent of Prince of Wales in Bombay, the Parsees of Bombay tried to create disturbance to sabotage the strike.

But trouble started in other quarters. The common people, the victims of vigorous exploitation, especially the peasantry, became violently anti-British. The scar of 1857 had not yet been totally healed and at that time rise of armed struggle against the colonialist in Bengal, Maharastra and Punjab made British to spend sleepless nights. And at the same time, the rise of Lal, Bal and Pal, the three radical leaders of Congress, and their demand for Purna Swaraj (total freedom) made the situation more complex. The rise of armed struggle in Bengal reached such height that the British had to shift their capital at a safer place in Delhi, in 1911.

At this Juncture of history, the British and its loyal zamindars and new capitalists were badly in need of a new kind of leadership guided by a new kind of philosophy for a smooth continuation of their design. They were vigorously in search of a new ideology that would be absolutely harmless for the British Crown and a new kind of leadership that would be inwardly loyal but outwardly anti-British. A leadership, that would ultimately be able to misguide the entire freedom movement to wrong destination. In Gandhi, in South Africa and in his creed of nonviolence, they could discover both the leadership and the creed.

## GANDHI'S LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH CROWN :

In 1891, Gandhi returned from England as a barrister and in the next year he sailed to South Africa to fight a case for an Indian business firm Dada Abdulla & Co., against an immigrant Indian Muslim Tyabji Haji Khan Muhammad. During his brief stay in India, he wrote a few essays and sent them to Sri Gopal Krishna Gokhale and according to Sri Gokhale, those were hopelessly rubbish. It should be mentioned here that Gandhi somehow managed to pass the Matriculation Examination in 1887 in the third division, scoring 247 out of 625, and this was the only certificate he could gather in his entire life.

In that time the black population of South Africa, including the immigrant Indians, were denied some vital civic rights by the discriminatory and racist government led by the British colonialists. In some occasions, Gandhi himself fell victim of the said racist discriminations. Here in South Africa, he applied his version of nonviolence as a political strategy and started a movement to earn some special privileges for the Indian community and later on this peaceful civil disobedience was named *Satyagraha*. Due to this movement the government of South Africa ultimately passed the Indian Relief Act-1914, granting some privileges to the Indians, only to glorify Gandhi. The followers of Gandhian nonviolence usually highlight this fact as a great victory of Gandhi and his creed.

But it is really amazing that, though apartheid had been abolished from the rest of the world quite a long ago, it continued in South Africa till May 1994, where Gandhi had fought it nearly hundred years ago. Furthermore, it is really astonishing that up to the last hour the white rulers of South Africa used to advise its non-white population and their leaders to adopt Gandhian type nonviolent movement. However, one thing Gandhi could conclusively prove through his struggle and other activities in South Africa that his loyalty to the British Crown was firm and unwavering, and he and his creed would never pose

a threat to the British Empire. And hence the British imperialists had little difficulty to gauge his profound respect for the British race, extraordinarily high esteem for the British culture and extreme loyalty towards the throne of England.

While commenting on this aspect, historian Dr. A. C. Roy writes, "Gandhi had enough respect for the British cultural heritage. He strongly believed that the intercourse between India and Britain would be beneficial for the Indians". He further writes, "In the early part of his life, he (Gandhi) was not anti-British. ... It is true that, he was against the strong nationalist movement that swept India in the wake of partition of Bengal in 1905. It is also true that nationalist views of leaders like Sri Aurobinda Ghosh, Lala Lajpat Rai etc. could hardly influence Gandhi". And in fact, Gandhi supported the British decision of partitioning of Bengal. During his stay in South Africa, Gandhi, to express his loyalty to the British Crown, used to sing the British National Anthem at public functions. Later on, he could discover violence in the lines of the British Anthem :

***"Scatter her enemies, and make them fall;***
***Confound their politics;***
***frustrate their knavish tricks"***

"Despite this, his loyalty to the British Empire was unsullied", says Sri D. Keer, the most renowned biographer of Gandhi. In fact, while in South Africa Gandhi never missed a single opportunity to project himself as a loyal subject of the British Empire. Queen Victoria died in 1901, and Gandhi, to express his loyalty to the British Crown, sent condolence message to England, placed a wreath at Queen's statue in Durban and distributed souvenirs containing Queen's pictures among the school children. On the occasion of coronation of the British King George-V, Gandhi expressed his loyalty to the throne of England and said, "The Indian residents of this country (i.e. South Africa) sent congratulatory cablegrams on the occasion, thus declaring their loyalty".

In 1899, a war between the Dutch settlers, called Boers, and the British in South Africa broke out. Gandhi then organized, of his own accord, an ambulance corps of immigrant Indians, 1100 strong, for the Red Cross and they served the British soldiers who were wounded in the war. The British government of South Africa, in recognition of his sincere service to the British Empire, awarded a medal and a certificate of excellence to Gandhi. Even in his declining years of his life, Gandhi used to recall proudly how his loyalty had served the British during

the Boer War, and in some occasions risked his life as he strongly believed that the British Empire existed for the welfare of the world.

The Negroes or the original inhabitants of South Africa were divided in many tribes, e.g. the Zulus, the Swazis, the Basutos and the Bechuanas. Among them, the tallest and the most handsome were the Zulus. All these native tribes, including the Zulus were victims of barbaric torture and inhuman exploitation by the British occupiers. As a result of these seething discontents, the Zulus ultimately rose in revolt. In February, 1906, they rose to revolt against the Natal Government. The Zulu chief advised members of his tribe non-payment of new tax imposed upon them. This resulted in assassination of a sergeant and the clash that followed developed into a rebellion.

It is a shame that being a non-white himself, Gandhi should have sided with the Zulus, but he supported the British. "His lip sympathy was for the Zulus, but his head was with the British Empire". The British Government of Natal ruthlessly put down the rebellion. Though Gandhi confessed that it was not a war but a man-hunt, he sided with the British. Later on, to justify his action, Gandhi wrote in his autobiography, **"But I then believed that the British Empire existed for the welfare of the world. A genuine sense of loyalty prevented me from even wishing ill to the Empire".** This time as well, the British Government of South Africa recognized his service by presenting him a gold medal and the title of *Kaiser-i-Hind.*

It should be mentioned here that Gandhi used to maintain the view that India would be benefited by its British connection and it would be a calamity to break the connection between the British people and the people of India. And there is no doubt that due to this unwavering loyalty to the British Crown, he was chosen by the British to bring him back to India to lead the freedom movement, or to sabotage the freedom movement. Apart from his unwavering loyalty to the British Empire, Gandhi was chosen by the British as the new leader of freedom struggle and his newly invented doctrine of nonviolence as the lone ideology of freedom struggle as it was not difficult for the British to understand that his harmless and nonviolent *Satyagraha* would pose no threat to the British Empire. It has been pointed out earlier that British in India, at that time, were terribly afraid of violent freedom struggle launched by the patriots of Bengal, Maharastra and Punjab. But Gandhi, through his speeches and writings, could have managed to expose that he was against any sort of violence in Indian freedom movement.

When Khudiram Bose and Prafulla Chaki threw bombs on Englishmen at Muzaffarpur in Bihar on April 30, 1908, Gandhi immediately condemned the incident and said, **"They had no reason to rejoice at the introduction of Russian methods. They could neither achieve real Swaraj by following the path of evil, i.e. by killing British, nor by establishing factories".** It should be mentioned here that, to explain Satyagraha, he used to say, **"A Satyagrahi should expect to get killed by an aggressor and not to kill him".** One should recall here that instruction of Hindu scriptures is to kill an aggressor without giving a second thought.

On that occasion, Bal Gangadhar Tilak wrote 3 articles in the *Kesari*, supporting the action of Khudiram, and was sentenced by the British for 6 years in prison. On the contrary, Gandhi condemned Tilak and in his *Indian Opinion*, wrote,

**"He (Tilak) aimed at inciting Indians against British rule. The rulers are justified, from their point of view, in taking action against him. ...We submit that Mr. Tilak's view should be rejected".** There is no doubt that Tilak was the first among the Indian leaders who boldly stood up to terminate British rule in India, while "Gandhi devoted years of his life to reform British imperialism". It should be mentioned here that Gandhi used to write that his strategy of passive resistance (Satyagraha) was always infinitely superior to physical power (perhaps due to the simple reason that it was harmless for the British rulers.).

Madan Lal Dhingra was a student at an engineering college in London. He was a revolutionary, a follower of Veer Savarkar and killed Dr. Curzon Wyllies, a tyrant, on July 1, 1909. He also shot and killed Dr. Cawas Lalcaca while he tried to save Wyllie. **Gandhi deplored Dhingra for this violence and condemned Savarkar for supporting Dhingra.** Moreover, Gandhi asked people like Dhingra to abandon violence and adopt nonviolent Satyagraha as the means to fight British power and earn freedom. There is no doubt that all such actions and utterances of Gandhi encouraged British to bring Gandhi to India and put him at the helm of the freedom movement, so that nonviolent Satyagraha could be the only mode of Indian Freedom struggle. So they were in search of a dependable stooge who could be taken into confidence to tell their plan and used as a messenger to communicate the plan to Gandhi.

At that historic hour, people of this country saw Sri Gopal Krishna Gokhale to sail to London and visit South Africa on his return journey. He landed at Cape Town on October 22, 1912, and pressed Gandhi

to return to India. While in London, Gokhale requested to the Prime Minister Mr. Gladstone to repeal the so called Black Act of South Africa, an unjust tax of £3 per Indian, for which Gandhi was then fighting. Mr. Gladstone agreed just to glorify Gandhi. After reaching South Africa, Gokhale, whom Gandhi revered as his political guru, communicated this piece of news to Gandhi and said that he (Gandhi) would have to return to India within a year (according to the plan of their British master).

So after one year and nine months he had met Gokhale, Gandhi, after staying 21 years in South Africa, came to India, via London. He left Cape Town by S.S. Kinfauns Castle on July 18, 1914, accompanied by his wife Smt. Kasturva and his German friend Mr. Kalenbuch, and reached London on August 6. He again sailed from London on December 19, 1914, for India and landed Bombay on January 9, 1915. Thus he stayed nearly 5 months in England on his way back to India.

While in London, he wrote in *Satyagraha,* "I sailed for England to meet Gokhale on my way back to India, with mixed feelings of pleasure and regret – pleasure because I was returning home after many years and eagerly looked forward serving the country under Gokhale's guidance, regret because it was a great wrench for me to leave South Africa, where I have passed 21 years of my life sharing to the full in sweets and bitters of human experience, and where I have realized my vocation in life".

The January 5, 2009 edition of the renowned daily *The Times of India* carried a press report titled *"Gandhi donned army uniform for the British"*, that said, **"It might seem surprising but it is that in the year 1899, Mahatma Gandhi donned a uniform. This uniform belonged to a voluntary ambulance unit, which he created"** (article by J P Chaturvadi published in the *Sainik Samachar* edition of October 9, 1977). The article contained a rare picture of Gandhi sporting the British Army uniform during the Anglo-Boer war that broke out in South Africa in 1899. It has been mentioned above that the Dutch had their own colony in South Africa and in 1899, a clash of interest began between these two colonialists which turned into a military conflict in December, 1899 and simply to please the British Government, Gandhi created the said 1,100 strong Indian volunteer and the stretcher bearer corps. During the war Gandhi was personally sympathetic to the Dutch. But, he later on confessed that, to please the British he sacrificed his conscience.

"The performance of his voluntary ambulance unit was appreciated by all when the Anglo-Boer war ended in 1902, after the capture of Transvaal. This unit consisted of 1,100 Indians. The commander-in-chief of the army mentioned the heroic deeds performed by this ambulance unit, whose workers walked 20 to 25 miles a day to carry out voluntary duties to help the injured", says the article. After the victory in the war, British Government presented a medal and a citation to Gandhi which he preserved with great respect till his death. It has also been mentioned above that Gandhi strongly believed that the British Empire was for the welfare of the entire world and he maintained this view till his death. Later, Gandhi proudly recalled how he loyally served the British during the Boer War and put his life in peril, particularly while his ambulance corps was working at the battle fields of Colenso, Spion Kop and Vaalkranz.

While in South Africa, Gandhi did not miss a single opportunity to please the British crown. Just after the Boer war, Gandhi expressed his loyalty by sending felicitation to Queen Victoria on her birthday. Queen Victoria died in January, 1901 and Gandhi sent a condolence message to the Colonial Secretary in London and laid a wreath on the pedestal of the Queen's statue in Durban and distributed picture of the Queen among the school children. Later on, when George-V was coroneted as the king of England, Gandhi expressed his loyalty by sending congratulatory telegram to England that read, "The Indian residents of this country (i.e. South Africa) sent congratulatory cablegrams on the occasion, thus declaring their loyalty". It has also been mentioned above that to please the British colonialists, Gandhi used to sing National Anthem of Great Britain in public meetings though he could discover violence in the following two lines of the song.

In 1909, Lord Ampthill visited South Africa and Gandhi was out to please him by whatever means he could. The British statesmen and rulers always wanted a man who condemned extremists and revolutionists in India and Gandhi took the opportunity to please Armphill by deploring the revolutionaries of India and their policy. Through several letters, Gandhi tried to convince him that his doctrine of passive resistance or nonviolent Satyagraha has no intention to hurt others – 'a satyagrahi do not inflict sufferings on others, but he invites it on himself'. Many believe that it was the fundamental reason that inspired the British to bring Gandhi to India, made him the supreme leader of Indian freedom movement and his creed of Satyagraha the only mode of freedom struggle in India.

## GANDHI WAS A BRITISH AGENT AND BROUGHT FROM SA BY BRITISH TO SABOTAGE INDIA'S FREEDOM STRUGGLE :

It has been mentioned above that at that time, British in India were terribly afraid of violent freedom struggle launched by the patriots of Bengal, Maharastra and Punjab and particularly in Bengal, where life of an Englishman was not safe. So in 1911, the British Government on India had to shift its capital from Calcutta to a safer place in New Delhi. But it has been pointed out above that Gandhi, through his speeches and writings, could have managed to expose that he was against any sort of violence in Indian freedom movement.

Why Gopal Krishna Gokhale took so much interest in bringing Gandhi back to India? The reader would recall that on 28 December 1885, British government of India formed the Indian National Congress with Allan Octavian Hume as the president and few other eminent, loyal and English educated Indians like Dadabhai Naoroji, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Phirozeshah Mehta and so on. The sole intention was simply to get prior information of what Indians were thinking and going to do in near future so that another Sepoy Mutiny might not recur. At the beginning it was like an elite club dominated by the loyalists. But later on, appearance of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bepin Bihari Pal (popularly known as Lal Bal Pal), the scenario changed considerably. Lokamanya Tilak was first to embrace independence of India from British rule as the national goal and it aroused the first spurt of nationalism among the members of the Congress.

In 1906, the Congress was split into two. The group led by Tilak and supported by Lala Lajpat Rai and Bepin Bihari Pal was known as the extremist group, while the loyalists were called the moderates. Gradually, the extremists, with the help of mass support, gained popularity and emerged as the dominant group while the moderates lost their control over the Congress. So, when the British took Gokhale into confidence and disclosed their plan to bring loyalist Gandhi to

India and make him the sole leader of Congress, Gokhale found to ray of hope to regain their hegemony in the Congress. He readily supported the intrigue and agreed to play a mediator between Gandhi and the British.

So after one year and nine months he had met Gokhale, Gandhi, after staying 21 years in South Africa, came to India, via London. After landing at the Mumbai port, he, as the most important British loyalist, wrote a letter to the Governor of Bombay Presidency expressing his promise that he would always abide by his instructions. Many believe that he went to London to receive the parting instruction from his British master.

During his brief stay in London, Gandhi, the apostle of nonviolence, deplored Madanlal Dhingra and other revolutionaries (as per instruction of the British master), declared them anarchists and said, "Is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death?" He also said that he wanted to purge India of the atmosphere of suspicion on either side and there was no reason for anarchism in India.

The reader should recall the First World War began in Europe on 28 June 1914, and Gandhi, immediately after reaching India, started to recruit Indian soldiers for the British army, simply to express his loyalty to the British Empire. It is important to note that, Gandhi, the apostle of nonviolence, who claimed to have discovered a weapon on nonviolence to end violence in the world, supported war and according to his promise to the British master, recruited Indians to be sacrificed in the violence of the war. He used to travel about 20 miles a day and addressed meetings at Nadiad, Kathlal, Karamsad, Godhra, Jambusar, Vadlhal and other places for recruitment, under the presidentship of the Commissioner Pratt. People used to ask him, **"You are a prophet of nonviolence, how can you ask us to take up arms? What good has the British Government done for India to deserve our cooperation?"** But Gandhi had to keep mum. It was not possible for him to say that he was doing all these things as the most loyal slave of the British crown. It should be mentioned here that the staunch followers of Gandhi, even today, refuse to acknowledge this glaring example of hypocrisy of Gandhi.

He then took up the other important task to please his British master and that was disarming the revolutionaries of India. It has been said earlier that at that time violent freedom struggle was going on

in Bengal, Punjab, Maharastra and elsewhere and the patriots of Bengal were playing the leading role in this direction under the leadership of Sri Aurobinda Ghosh, Barin Ghosh, Jatin Das, Surya Sen and others. The British Government was terribly afraid of the revolutionaries of Bengal. So Gandhi visited Bengal to extinguish the fire of violent freedom struggle with his false creed of nonviolence.

Such an effort was also necessary for Gandhi, most loyal stooge of the British, to make India safe for the British Empire, when it was in its difficult hour like World War-I. So, as the first step, he went to Bengal and delivered the first blow against Indian Revolutionaries at a meeting of Bengal youth. On April 24, 1915, in a meeting organized by the Madras Bar Association, Gandhi proudly declared, **"It gives me the greatest pleasure this evening at this very great and important gathering to re-declare my loyalty to the British Empire and my loyalty is based upon very selfish grounds. As a passive resister I discovered that I could not have that free scope which I had under the British Empire and I discovered that the British Empire has certain ideals with which I have fallen in love."**

That time onward, Gandhi renewed his effort of deploring the revolutionaries of this country to please the British. He asked the youths of Bengal and of other provinces to give up violence. On April 27, 1915, he asked the students of Madras to give up political assassination and political robberies and conquer the conquerors not by shedding blood but by sheer force of spiritual predominance. He deplored Khudiram, Madanlal Dhingra, condemned Savarkar for supporting Dhingra and deplored other revolutionaries like Biplabi Rashbehari Bose. It should be mentioned that even an Englishman W S Blunt praised Dhinra and described him a great patriot (My Diary, Part-II, pp-288). But Gandhi condemned violence and said that it was an evil path and the revolutionaries were anarchists. At that time, Lokamanya Tilak was arrested in Mumbai because he wrote three articles in the *Kesari* in support of Khudiram's bomb explosion at Muzaffarpur, and was sentenced on July 22, 1908, to six years' transportation. Gandhi deplored Tilak on the charge of inciting Indians against British rule.

Gandhi strongly believed that India's connection with the British was a blessing and used to say that "it would be a calamity to break that connection between the British people and the people of India." Hence he used to say, **"Satyagraha is not to hurt British and**

**should never hurt the British."** He also assured the British that he would never adopt violent means against the British Empire and protection of British Raj was necessary for the interest of Swaraj. It has been mentioned earlier that Gandhi never fought for India's freedom. On the contrary, he used to say that there was no need to end British rule in India and Demand of INDEPENDENCE was DENIAL OF GOD. Later, he himself confessed that he did not work for India's independence.

It has been pointed out earlier that he reproached the leaders like Subhash Chandra Bose and others because they were in favour of demanding independence. He also blamed C F Andrews for demanding complete INDEPENDENCE. It is needless to say that all such utterances of Gandhi made the British colonialists extremely pleased. This made Sir Samuel Hoare, the Viscount of Templewood to comment that **Gandhi was one of the best friends of the British**. But later on in 1930, Gandhi was compelled to support the independence proposal simply to gain control over the Congress. Many believe that while in London on his way back to India, he promised that he will always inform the Viceroy in advance what he is going to do as his next step and take prior permission from him. There is no doubt that he kept the word of his British master up to his last breath.

It becomes evident from the above discussions that Gandhi was brought from South Africa by the British to sabotage indian freedom movement. Before his coming to India, Gopal Krishna Gokhel and C F Andrews played the mediators between Gandhi and the British Government in India and persuaded Gandhi, on behalf of British government, to return to India. So Gandhi went to London to collect his appointment letter and from London came to India on January 9, 1915. Many argue that before Gandhi the Indian freedom movement was confined among some elites, but Gandhi turned India's freedom struggle into a mass movement. But, on the contrary, it indicates the great success of the British conspiracy - the entire population was led astray by Gandhi and there remained none to carry out the freedom struggle.

It should be mentioned here that Gandhi adopted his Dress-code of dhoti-chaddar to fool the People of India. In South Africa, Gandhi used Western dress-code. But while returning to India, Gandhi thought that the adoption of traditional dress code of Gujarati farmers with a big head-dress would draw much public sentiment. So he landed at the Bombay port, on 1st September, 1915. in the said attire. But as soon as he could detect that the said dress code failed to generate

the public attraction he wanted, he immediately switched over to traditional Hindu dress of dhoti and chaddar.

Many apprehend that one of the final instructions he received from his British master at London was that he would always keep the Viceroy informed about his future actions and hence to seek his permission. It is apparent that he obeyed his employer in this regard till his death. The apostle of nonviolence, as per instruction of the British master, declared Indian revolutionaries as anarchists and said, "Is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death?" He also said that he wanted to purge India of the atmosphere of suspicion on either side and there was no reason for anarchism in India.

The Indian media, controlled by the British and the loyal zamindars and the new capitalists at once started to project him as a demigod and describe his utterances as the prophetic words or the articulations of a second Buddha. Very soon he was addressed as a Jagat Vandaniya Pundit by Jivaram Kalidas Shastri of the Rasa Shala Aushadhashram at Gondal, Gujarat and the Indian media at once started to use the word in their endeavour to make a commoner Gandhi a great man. This media also publicized his Satyagraha at Champaran, Bihar, his Kheda Movement and his way of tackling the striking textile workers of Ahmedabad as unique and unprecedented in Indian history. Thus within a few years he was made the undisputed leader of Indian freedom movement and his creed of nonviolence was established as the sole ideology of Indian freedom struggle.

It is not at all surprising and one can easily understand how quickly the media can create great leaders in this country out of a common lot, in the hour of necessity. Perhaps the reader will recall how quickly, nearly two decades ago, the media turned a sparingly educated airplane driver into a great leader. The reader will also recall that the obstinate younger brother of that airplane operator was made a great leader by the media and his unlawful criminal activities of that rowdy was highlighted as the vigor of his youth by the media. One should also recall that the said ruffian younger brother was criminally prosecuted and jailed in London for an alleged car theft, but ultimately managed to get out of prison by the clandestine manipulations of his illustrious grandfather. The people of this country has also seen how media has succeeded to elevate the uneducated foreign born widow of that airplane operator into a great leader and the same media is now busy in turning

the uneducated son and daughter of that airplane operator into great leaders so that a dynastic rule could continue.

In the present context, the reader should also recall that the said airplane operator, when he was the Prime Minister of this country, could do nothing for the country but to drown it into foreign debt. When he took his office as the PM, India's foreign debt was $ 23.5 billion and during his tenure the figure rose to $ 86.5 billion. After the 2004 Parliament election, the Congress party and its allies selected the said widow of that airplane operator as the next PM, despite the fact that she was a foreign national still holding Passport of a foreign nation. Many believe that the said widow runs an antique shop at her native place in Italy of valuable antiques smuggled from India.

## GANDHI AND HIS MUSLIM APPEASEMENT :

It is now well known that Muslim appeasement was an inseparable part of Gandhi's quack doctrine of Non-violence. But many do not know why he, while he was in South Africa, adopted, or compelled to adopt this dirty policy in 1908. At that time the South African government imposed an unjust tax of £ 3 on every Indian living in South Africa and Gandhi initiated talks with South African government on this matter. But the Muslims did not support this move and were displeased with Gandhi. In addition to that Gandhi, in one occasion, made some critical comments on Islam while he was speaking at a gathering. Furthermore, he tried to make a comparative estimate of Hinduism, Islam and Christianity, which made the Muslims furious.

A few days later, on 10th February 1908, a group of Muslims under the leadership of a Pathan called Mir Alam entered Gandhi's house and beat him mercilessly. When Gandhi fell on the ground the Muslim attackers kicked him right and left and beat him with sticks. They also threatened to kill him. From this incident onward, Gandhi stopped to make any critical comment on Muslims as well as on Islam. According to Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, this incident was a milestone in Gandhi's life and afterwards Gandhi began to over look even the most heinous crime committed by the Muslims.

An example would help the reader to understand the matter. On 23rd December 1926, a Muslim assassin called Abdul Rashid stabbed Swami Shraddhananda to death, when the swami was ill and lying on his bed. The reader may recall that Swami Shraddhananda was a *pracharak* (whole time worker) of Arya Samaj and he started a Suddhai Yajna to bring the converted Muslims of this country back to Hinduism. But his activity was detested by the Muslims. A couple of months earlier a Muslim woman came to the Swami and expressed her desire to return to Hinduism with her children. However her husband

brought an allegation of abduction in the court of law against the Swami. But the court quashed the allegation and set the Swami free. The incident turned the Muslims extremely furious and within a few days Abdul Rashid assassinated him.

After a few days of this incident, Gandhi went to Gauhati to deliver his speech at the national conference of Indian National Congress. The atmosphere was depressed and gloomy due to unusual and unfortunate death of Shraddhananda. But Gandhi made everyone dumbfounded and began his speech by addressing the assassin Abdul Rashid as "Bhai (brother) Abdul Rashid". Without caring for the reaction of the listeners, he continued, "Now you will perhaps understand why I have called Abdul Rashid a brother, and I repeat it. I do not even regard him as guilty of Swami's murder. Guilty indeed are those who excited feeling of hatred against one another." Thus he indirectly held Swami Shraddhananda responsible for his murder, as he was propagating hatred through his Suddhi Yajna. Moreover, he wrote in the obituary note, "He (the Swami) lived a hero. He died a hero." In other words, if a Hindu falls victim to the knife of a Muslim's assassin, Hindus should consider it a heroic death.

It should be pointed out here that the said policy of Muslim appeasement originated by Gandhi, under the garb of (pseudo) secularism was responsible for the Partition of the country in 1947. Many of our countrymen, still today, firmly believe that Gandhi was against partition as in the public meetings, he used to say, **"Vivisect me, before you vivisect India".** When he was saying this in public meetings, he was expressing just the opposite view through his writings. The reader may recall that, on March 26, 1940, the leaders of the Muslim League raised the issue of creation of Pakistan as a separate homeland for them. Hardly a couple of weeks later, Gandhi, supporting the demand, wrote, **"Like other group of people in this country, Muslims also have the right of self determination. We are living here as a joint family and hence any member has the right to get separated."** (Harijan, April 6, 1940). A couple of years later, he also wrote, **"If majority of the Muslims of this country maintain that they are a different nation and there is nothing common with the Hindus and other communities, there is no force on the earth that can alter their view. And if on that basis, they demand partition that must be carried out. If Hindus dislike it, they may oppose it",** (Harijan, April 18, 1942).

The reader should also recall that the Congress Working Committee, in its session on June 12, 1947, decided to place the partition issue to be placed before the All India Congress Committee (AICC) for a debate and the AICC approved the issue in its session held on June 14-15, 1947. In the beginning of the debate, on June 14, veteran Congress leaders like Purusottamdas Tandon, Govindaballav Panth, Chaitram Gidwani and Dr S Kichlu etc. placed their very convincing speeches against the motiom. **Then Gandhi, setting aside all other speakers, spoke for 45 minutes supporting partition.** The main theme of his deliberation was that, if Congress did not accept partition (1) other group of people or leaders (Hinting at Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose and his party) would avail the opportunity and throw the Congress out of power and (2) a chaotic situation would prevail throughout the country. Many believe that, in the name of 'chaotic condition', he tacitly asked the Muslims to begin countrywide communal riot, if the Congress did not accept the partition. Till then, Sardar Ballavbhai Patel was on the fence regarding partition. But Gandhi's speech turned him into a firm supporter of partition and he influenced other confused members to support the issue. In this way, Congress approved the partition issue (History of Freedom Movement in India, R C Majumdar, Vol-III, p-670).

It may appear to many that, up to partition, Gandhi's policy of nonviolence and Muslim appeasement in the name of secularism indeed harmed the country a lot. But a close look will reveal, it has done severe damage even after partition, or to speak the truth, it is causing serious damage even today. During independence, the Muslim population in undivided India was 23 per cent and this 23 per cent Muslims, got 32 per cent land area as Pakistan. The most appropriate step after partition was to carry out population exchange. or send the entire Muslim population of the divided India to Pakistan and bring all Hindus and other non-Muslim groups from Pakistan to India. This population transfer was included in the proposal for Pakistan by the Muslim League and after communal riot in Bihar, M A Jinnah requested the Government of India to carry out population exchange as early as possible. But Gandhi was hell bent not to undertake the process and said that it was an impractical and fictitious proposal.

Mountbatten, the then Governor General of India, was a staunch supporter of the said population exchange and advised Jawaharlal Nehru to do the same without delay. But Nehru submitted to the will of Gandhi and refrained from doing so. It is needless to say that, from the practical

point of view, the said population exchange was urgently necessary and had it been carried out at that time, many problems of today would not have arisen. But due to the policy of Muslim appeasement of Gandhi, Muslims happily stayed back in this country, while Hindus had no alternative but to come to India as refugees or penniless beggars due to the religious persecution by the Muslims in Pakistan.

Many of us perhaps do not know that due to strong opposition by Gandhi, "Bande Mataram" could not be accepted as the National Anthem" of this country. In his early life, Gandhi had a great affinity for the song and while he was in South Africa, he wrote "It is nobler in sentiment and sweeter than the songs of other nations. While other anthems contain sentiments that are derogatory to others, Bande Mataram is quite free from such faults. Its only aim is to arouse in us a sense of patriotism. It regards India as the mother and sings her praise." But later on when he could discover that the Muslims dislike the song, he at once stopped singing or reciting the same at public places. Hence ultimately the "Jana Gana Mana" was selected as the National Anthem. During the debate over the matter in the Constituent Assembly, Nehru argued that Bande Mataram is not suitable to sing along with military band while Jana Gana Mana is free from this difficulty.

In the present context, it should also be pointed out that Gandhi was not pleased with the Tri Color, the National Flag of today's India because the Muslims disliked the same. In this regard, Sri Nathuram Godse has narrated an incident in his "Why I Assassinated Gandhi", which deserves to be noted in this context. During his Noakhali tour in 1946, a Congress worker put a tricolor over the temporary house where Gandhi was staying. One day an ordinary Muslim passer by objected to it and Gandhi immediately ordered his men to bring the flag down. So, to please an ordinary Muslim, Gandhi did not hesitate to disgrace and dishonor the flag revered by millions of Congress workers. (pp-75-76). It should also be pointed out here that in his early life, Gahdhi was very fond of the Hindi language and used to say that it was the only language having the potentiality to play the role of the national language. But to please the Muslim, he, later on tried his best to make Urdu, under the garb of Hindustani, the National Language of India. (Koenrad Elst, Gandhi and Godse, Voice of India, p – 89).

A few months before the partition, when Hindu and Sikh refugees started to come from West Punjab in droves and crowding the refugee

camps of Delhi, one day Gandhi visited a refugee camp and said, **"Hindus should never be angry against the Muslims even if the latter might make up their minds to undo their (Hindus') existence. If they put all of us to the sword, we should court death bravely. ... We are destined to be born and die, then why need we feel gloomy over it?"** (speech delivered on April 6, 1947).

In a similar occasion he said, **"The few gentlemen from Rawalpindi who called upon me, asked me, "What about those who still remain in Pakistan?" I asked, why they all came here (Delhi)? Why they did not die there? I still hold on to the belief that we should stick to the place where we happen to live, even if we are cruelly treated, and even killed. Let us die if the people kill us, but we should die bravely with the name of God on our tongue."** He also said, **"Even if our men are killed, why should we feel angry with anybody? You should realize that even if they are killed, they have had a good and proper end"** (speech delivered on November 23, 1947)

In this context, Gandhi also said, **"If those killed have died bravely, they have not lost anything but earned something. ... They should not be afraid of death. After all, the killers will be none other than our Muslim brothers."** (Shri Nathuram Godse, Why I Assassinated Gandhi, p-92,93; as quoted by Koenrad Elst in Gandhi versus Godse, Voice of India, p-121).

In another occasion when he was talking to a group of refugees, said, **"If all the Punjabis were to die to the last man without killing (a single Muslim), Punjab will be immortal. Offer yourselves as nonviolent willing sacrifices."** (Collins and Lapierre, Freedom at Midnight, p-385). There is no doubt that if someone reads all these utterances of Gandhi, he would take him either a fool or a lunatic, but we are worshiping him as a Mahatma or a Great Soul.

Gandhi believed that Muslims were brothers of the Hindus and hence they should never take up arms or wage a war against the Muslims. He used to say that the foreign policy of independent India should always be respectful to Islam and the Muslims. Moreover, independent India should never invade a Muslim country like Arabia, Turkey etc. Gandhi also said that Rana Pratap, Guru Govinda Singh, Raja Ranjit Singh and Raja Shivaji were misguided patriots because they fought war with the Muslims. In his eyes Goerge Washington, Garibaldi,

Kamal Pasha, D Valera, Lenin etc. were also misguided patriots as they encouraged violence.

Gandhi's utterances painting respected Hindu heroes as misguided patriots aroused widespread commotion among the Hindus. Most importantly, calling Raja Shivaji a misguided patriot put entire Maharastra on boil. Later on, Nehru could pacify their anger partially by begging apology on behalf of Gandhi.

The Muslims whenever attack a Hindu settlement, they, in addition to killing innocent people, setting their houses on fire, loot and burglary as their routine work, rape Hindu women. It is evident that, they commit all such oppressions according to the instructions of the Koran, revealed by Allah. During the Muslim rule that lasted for nearly 800 years, raping Hindu women became a common affair. To save their honour and sanctity from the lecherous Muslims, millions of Hindu women used to sacrifice their lives in flames. In the wake of partition most of the Hindu families became victims of Muslim oppression and raping Hindu women was an inseparable part of their attacks. When Hindus were butchered in Noakhali in 1946, thousands of Hindu women were raped by the Muslims.

In the wake of partition, thousands of Hindu and Sikh women abducted, raped, paraded naked through the streets and forcibly converted to Islam. When they arrived Delhi as refugees, 75,000 women were found to be pregnant. All of them underwent clinical abortion at the Kapoor's Clinic in Delhi and the entire cost was borne by the Government of India, despite at that time, abortion was illegal in India. Ms Urvashi Butalia has documented all these horrific experiences in her *The Other of Silence* (Penguin Books, 1998).

Many Hindus of this country do not know, what Gandhi, the Great Soul and the Apostle of nonviolence, thought about this behavior of the Muslims. In the 6th July, 1926, edition of the Navajivan, Gandhi wrote that **"He would kiss the feet of the (Muslim) violator of the modesty of a sister"** (Mahatma Gandhi, D Keer, Popular Prakashan, p-473). It has been mentioned that during partition, mass scale raping of both Hindu and Sikh women took place in West Pakistan, particularly in West Punjab by the Muslims. Gandhi advised these women that **if a Muslim expressed his desire to rape a Hindu or a Sikh lady, she should never refuse him but cooperate with him. She should lie down like a dead with her tongue in between her teeth.** (D Lapierre and L Collins, Freedom at Midnight, Vikas, 1997, p-479).

From the above narrations, it becomes evident that Gandhi was never moved by the sufferings and miseries of the Hindus and, on the contrary, he used to shed tears for the Muslims. His idea of Hindu-Muslim amity was also extremely biased and prejudiced. Only Hindus are supposed to make all sacrifices for it and they should endure all the oppressions and heinous crimes of the Muslims without protest. And that was the basis of Gandhian nonviolence and secularism. So a Muslim called Khalifa Haji Mehmud of Lurwani, Sind, once said **"Gandhi was really a Mohammedan"** (D Keer, ibid, p-237).

## MORE ON GANDHI'S MUSLIM APPEASEMENT :

It should be mentioned at the very outset that Gandhi never fought for India's freedom. The reader should recall that Gandhi was brought from South Africa by the British to sabotage India's freedom movement and hence it was not possible for him to fight the British for freedom. On the contrary, his intention was to prolong British rule in this country and to hoodwink the Hindus, he used to say that he was fighting for Swaraj. But his concept Swaraj was entirely mystical and incredible and he used to equate Swaraj with Ramrajya (or the rule of Lord Ram). According to him, termination of British rule was not at all necessary to establish Swaraj and Swaraj could function well even under the British rule. So he always opposed any move for demanding complete independence from the British rule and reproached the leaders like Subhash Chandra Bose and others because they were in favour of demanding independence,

One of the basic preconditions of his Swaraj was the amity between the Hindus and the Muslims. It has been pointed out earlier that his idea of Hindu-Muslim amity was extremely biased and prejudiced – Hindus were supposed to make every sacrifice and silently endure all the oppressions and crimes of the Muslims for the sake of this unity. It is well known that, for the sake of this Hindu-Muslim unity, Gandhi supported the KHILAFAT MOVEMENT, an extremely communal agitation launched by the fanatic and orthodox Muslim leaders, the Ali brothers. In his personal capacity, Gandhi once wanted to translate *Spirit of Islam* by Syed Amir Ali and Muhammad's biography *Life of Mahomet* by Sir W Muir, to win the hearts of the Muslims. To appease them, he used to overlook and ignore even heinous crimes committed by the Muslims and considered "Allahu Akbar" as a national slogan. He held the view that, Hindus should die but never should kill a Muslim. Many used to consider him a more devout Muslim than even Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

To many. it would appear unbelievable that Gandhi used to advise the Amir of Afghanistan not to make peace with India and, on the contrary, instigated him to launch jihad against India or invade India. Moreover, he advised the Muslims of this country that, at such a situation, they should join the Afghan army and fight against India. He used to say that **"Muslims are bullies and the Hindus are cowards"** and advise the Muslims to be more cruel and violent during their attack on the Hindus. On the other hand, he suggested the Hindus to remain non-violent and not to defend their attack. He used to maintain the view that Hindus must not strike a Muslim even to save their lives. In the wake of partition, when the Muslims started slaughtering the innocent Hindus of Punjab, Sardar Vallabbhai Patel asked the Hindus to defend their lives. But that displeased Gandhi and he reproached Patel for his advice.

In 1946, Gandhi did not go to Noakhali when the Hindus were being butchered there and he went there when the bloodshed was over. On the contrary, when the Hindus of Bihar started retaliating the Noakhali killings, he at once went to Bihar to save the Muslims. Due to his extraordinary affection for the Muslims, many used to mention him as Mohammad Gandhi. To many, it would appear unbelievable that Gandhi used to advise the Hindus (for the sake of nonviolence) not to take part in any short of physical exercise and body-building activities as, in that case, it would have been difficult for the Muslims to oppress and massacre the physically strong Hindus. In fact, he closed most of the gymnasiums and other body-building centres in Gujarat.

Gandhi strongly believed that Muslim rule was better for India than the British rule and in the wake of independence, he requested the British to transfer the power to the Muslims. At the same time, he started to look for an efficient Muslim emperor to rule this country. But doing so much for the Muslims, he remained a loathsome kafir in the eyes of the Muslims as Koran does not advocate Hindu-Muslim unity. On the contrary, Allah advises the Muslims to kill non-Muslim kafirs whenever and wherever they could be found (Koran – 9:5). So the Muslim leader Mohammad Ali said, **"In my eye, Gandhi is worse than a fallen Mussalman."**

It has been pointed out earlier, what kind of vile and treacherous role Gandhi played during independence. After independence, both

Gandhi and Nehru started vehemently to erase all the symbols that carry Hindu heritage. They declined to rename divided India as "Hindustan" and started to mention it as non-Pakistan and ultimately they settled at "Indian Republic." But most of the countries in the world are known according to the name of the majority of the population, e.g. France, Germany, England, Ireland, Turkey, Afghanistan and so on. While commenting on Gandhi and his policy of Muslim appeasement, in the name of nonviolence, Sri Aurobinda once said, **"India will be free to the extent it succeeds in shaking off the spell of Gandhism."**

## GANDHI AND JIHAD BY THE MOPLAHS IN KERALA :

The present topic will remain incomplete if we do not discuss Gandhi's deeds during the jihad launched by the Moplahs in Kerala in 1921, against the Hindus. At that time Kerala was a Princely state called Travancore under the Madras Presidency. Malabar was a small district of Travancore having a population of 3 million out of which 1 million were Muslims known as Moplahs, which was a corrupt Mollah. Historians believe that once upon a time Arab traders and their sailors and crews settled in the district, married local women and grew into a sizable population of Muslims.

These Moplahs were mostly illiterate and poor and nearly all of them used to earn their bread as agricultural labourers in the fields of well off Nambudri Brahmins. Like Muslims of other parts of the world, they were extremely cruel and used to declare jihad against the Hindus on flimsy ground and attack Hindus of the locality. From the beginning of the English rule, they launched 35 attacks within 1920 AD.

In August, 1921, when Gandhi was touring Assam, Silhet and Silchar, Moplahs organized a severe and unprovoked attack on 20th August on the Hindus. Large scale slaughtering the Hindus, looting their properties, setting their houses on fire, raping Hindu women, desecration of Hindu temples and forceful conversion to Islam went on without any respite. The cruelty, brutality and horridness of the attacks were far-reaching and incomprehensible. At that time, there were two options before the Hindus – either conversion to Islam or death.

A Muslim called Ali Musaliar was leading the attack. To bring the situation under control, British government declared martial law in the district but the rampage continued up to December. So the British had to prolong the martial law up to February 24, 1922. According

to government records, 2300 Hindus were dead and 1650 Hindus were severely wounded, although the actual figures were more than double of the above account.

In many occasions, Gandhi, the apostle of nonviolence, decried forceful conversion as a terribly violent act. But regarding the forceful conversion by the Moplahs, he preferred to remain mum. Moreover, he propagated the lie in *Young India* that the Moplahs, during the said rampage, had converted only a single Hindu to Islam. Most shamefully he described the killing of the innocent Hindus by the Moplahs as a heroic deed and he repeatedly said, "Muslims are bullies and the Hindus are cowards." Moreover, he used to say that the Moplahs were not guilty of killing the Hindus and, guilty were the Hindus who infuriated and provoked the Moplahs who had had no other option but to kill the Hindus. In addition to that, he asked the Hindus, for the sake of humanity, not to retaliate. There is no doubt that Gandhi, by safe guarding the Moplahs, instigated the Muslims to launch attacks on the Hindus in Punjab, Bengal and in other places in the wake of partition.

More shamefully, Gandhi deplored the British administration for taking stern action to suppress the jihad by the Moplahs. Moreover, he declared Moplahs, who fought with the British army, as freedom fighters and said, "The Moplahs are among the bravest in the land. They are god-fearing. Their bravery must be transformed into purest gold."...Thus **"He represented the perpetrators of vile deeds as god-fearing people! Was it not a travesty of religion to describe men who murder and rape in the name of religion as god-fearing? ... Gandhi thus described the Moplah ferocity as the ignorant fanaticism of the Moplah brothers, and the Hindu mentality as cowardliness."** (Mahatma Gandhi, D Keer, ibid, pp-402). The matter did not end here. Due to perpetual insistence by Gandhi, the Moplah rogues, who died in police encounter, were later on declared martyrs of the freedom struggle and were allowed to receive allowance, like other freedom fighters, from the government exchequer, after independence and the practice is still in vogue. After the carnage by the Moplahs, Gandhi started raising money from common people to help, not the Hindu victims, but for the Muslim perpetrators. Following the tradition set by Gandhi, the so called secular politicians and secular media in Mumbai observe Moplah Day every year and take out procession and hold public meetings, in favour of the Moplahs.

So, it is not difficult to understand that, had Gandhi been alive today, he would declare the killing of innocent Hindus in Kashmir, bombing the Hindu temples and killing innocent devotees, killing the Hindu pilgrims at Amarnath etc. as the bravery of the Muslims and cowardliness of Hindu victims. It also becomes evident that why today's so called secular politicians and their media held the Hindu victims of Godhra responsible for their own death and remained silent about the Muslims criminals, as a policy of Muslim appeasement. And by following the foot-steps of Gandhi, these secular and leftist political leaders raised money for the Muslims of Gujarat, not for the Hindu victims of Godhra. **Therefore many believe that Gandhi's naked Muslim appeasement during the Moplah incident was enough to assassinate him in 1920s and that would have saved this country from many misfortunes, brought by Gandhi later on.**

## GANDHI'S EXPERIMENTS WITH CELIBACY :

It is well known that Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, the most trusted and the most loyal stooge of the British Crown, served the British interest through his Satyagraha or the nonviolent freedom struggle. But most of the people of this country, who take him to be a man of high moral, do not know what short of vile lechery he indulged in in the name of keeping Brahmacharys or celibacy, or in experimenting with the same. In 1903, when he was only 34 years old ( alternatively in 1906, when he was 37), or in other words, when he was at the zenith of his youth, he took a vow that he will observe celibacy and will remain a brahmachari for the rest of his life (D Keer, Mahatma Gandhi, pp-73)..

But the question remains, what made Gandhi, an extremely sensual man, to take such a vow? Gandhi was so sensual that when his father Karamchand was dying, he preferred to make love and have sex with his wife Kasturba in another room of the same house. So, when such a sensual Gandhi took vow to keep celibacy, one becomes suspicious that there must have been an evil intention behind that vow. Many believe that at that time, he developed some form of aversion towards Kasturba, an illiterate mother of three children, or in other words, he disliked to share bed with her. So, his intention was to abandon Kasturba as a sleeping partner in the name of keeping celibacy.

In 1882, when Mohandas was married to Kasturba, he was 13 and Kasturba was 14. While he was in South Africa, he came in contact with several educated and well bred women through his profession and Gandhi liked their company very much. From their company, Gandhi used to obtain a special kind of intellectual pleasure, which was not possible from Kasturba. At that time, more than a dozen women came very close to him and six of them were of Western origin. They were Graham Polak, Nilla Cram Cook, Madelline Slade (aka Miraben), Margarate Spiegel, Sonja

Schlesin and Esther Faering (M V Kamath, Mahatma and Celibacy, Organiser, 2.7.2006). His closest Indian women were Srimati Prabhavati Devi (wife of Jaiprakash Narain), Kanchan Shah, Prema Ben Kantak, Sushila Nair (sister of Pyarelal), Manu Gandhi (wife of his grand-nephew Joysukhlal Gandhi), Ava Gandhi and Saraladevi Chaudhurani. This Saraladevi was a niece of the poet Rabindranath Tagore and her mother was Srimati Swarnakumari Devi (M V Kamath, ibid).

To narrate the affair between Gandhi and Saraladevi, Sri Girija Kumar says, "Saraladevi Caowdhurani came very close to Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Their whirl wind romance lasted for barely two years, but it upset the balance of the Gandhian establishment and shook its very roots. She is now a part of history and a footnote in contemporary Gandhian literature. She, however, left a scar in the minds of Gandhiji for the rest of his life." (*Brahmacharya: Gandhi and his Women Associates,* as quoted by M V Kamath, ibid.). Gandhi used to admit that his relation with Saraladevi went up to sexuality (Girija Kumar (1997), *The Book on Trial: Fundamentalism and Censorship in India*, Har-Anand Publishers. pp. 73–107).

Next to Saraladevi was Prabhavatidevi. While commenting on Gandhi's affair with her, Girija Kumar writes, "Prabhavati became so obssessed with Gandhi that she would not tolerate separation from him even for a single day. .... Her hysteria was highest manifestation of her desperation. She would remain unconscious for hours together...", (*Brahmacharya: Gandhi and his Women Associates,* as quoted by M V Kamath, ibid.). "In his own way, without, obviously meaning it, the Mahatma ruined many lives. It was only when he was jailed at the Agha Khan Palace that he came to be reconciled with Kasturba. And it was only after Gandhi died that Prabhavati came to live a normal life with her husband, until she died a premature death. Many detested Gandhi's so-called 'experiments' with celibacy" (M V Kamath, ibid). In 1938, Prema Ben Kantak wrote *Prasad and Diksha*, narrating her sex life with Gandhi, which triggered a widespread uproar in Maharastra.

However, the entire episode of his sexual perversion in the name of experimenting with celibacy or brahmacharya after coming back to India in 1915 and setting up the Sabarmati Ashram. And as a consequence, Gandhi started naked display of sex with his women associated, in a big way. This obviously aroused commotion among the other members of the ashram. "The main reason behind this uproar was his double standard. While for other members, he declared strict

law for renunciation of women, he kept himself above all such restrictions. As an excuse, he used to say that he was an ardhanariswar (or half man and half woman, the other name of Lord Shiva) and hence devoid of any carnal desire" (Yashodhara Roychowdhuri, Bengali daily Ananda Bazar Patrika, 25.6.2006). To hoodwink the other members, he used to say that he was the mother of all and hence every women of the ashram were either his mother or a sister. He used to deceive others in another way. He used to say that whatever he was doing, he was doing according to the command of his "*inner voice*", or, in other words, according to the command of the God and hence all his deeds were sacred.

Though, due to the above mentioned uproar by the other members of the ashram, Gandhi was compelled to stop his sexual activities for a time being. But that was only to resume it with a new enthusiasm in the name of experiments on celibacy and sleeping naked with several naked women on the same bed. At first, he and his women, though shared the same room but slept on different beds. But after a short while, naked Gandhi and his naked women companions started to share the same bed. Gandhi used to compare the nude women, who shared his bed, as blanket because they kept him warm and the practice was a type of naturopathy for him (Patricia Caplan (1987). *The Cultural construction of sexuality*, Routledge. pp. 278 & Parekh, Bhikhu C. (1999). *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*, Sage. pp-210 ). He also used to say that lying with so many naked women helped him a lot to assess his success in keeping celibacy, (Kumar, Girja (1997). *The Book on Trial: Fundamentalism and Censorship in India*, Har-Anand Publications. pp. 98, and Gandhi's letter to G D Birla in April, April, 1945). It should be mentioned here that Gandhi considered his experiment a success if, despite such extraordinary provocation, his private part refused to erect.

Many will refuse to believe that, after Satyagraha (or nonviolence), sex was his second major subject of his articles and letters he wrote to his eulogists. He wrote a series of five articles of his experiments on celibacy, i.e. lying naked with so many naked women, which were later published in Harijan ( Kumar, Girja (1997). *The Book on Trial: Fundamentalism and Censorship in India*, Har-Anand Publications. Pp-98.). In the present context, it should also be mentioned that, in general, young and adolescent boys experience wet dream. When he was in South Africa, Gandhi had wet dream at least once in a month. But it is

unbelievable that he had such an experience in Mumbai, when he was an old man of 67. This single incidence is more than enough to expose Gandhi's sexual perversion. Moreover, Gandhi admitted that till his death, he failed to get rid of his sexual perversion (D Keer,ibid, p-678).

According to Gandhi, active-celibacy meant perfect self control in the presence of opposite sex. Gandhi conducted his experiments with a number of women such as Abha, the sixteen-year-old wife of his grandnephew Kanu Gandhi. Gandhi acknowledged "that this experiment is very dangerous indeed", but thought "that it was capable of yielding great results" (Tidrick, Kathryn (2007). *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*. I.B.Tauris. pp. 302–304). Many believe that, in the name of active celibacy, he not only used those women, but as he never sought for consent of them, he committed sexual oppression on them. On the other hand, the victims had no other alternative but to endure all such oppressions silently (Yashodhara Roychowdhuri, Ananda Bazar Patrike, 25.6.2006).

While commenting on this aspect of Gandhi's life, Acharya Vinoba Bhave, a real brahmachari and the most earnest follower of Gandhi, said, "There was no need for Gandhi to experiment with brahmacharya. In case Gandhi was a perfect brahmachari, he did not require his brahmacharya to be tested; and if he was an imperfect brahmachari, he should have avoided the experiments on principle" (M V Kamath, Organiser-2.7.2006). But Gandhi maintained that all his experiments yielded very good results (Tidrick, Kathryn (2007). *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*, I.B.Tauris. pp. 302–304).

It has been pointed out above that Gandhi conducted his experiments with a number of young women such as Abha, the sixteen-year-old wife of his grandnephew Kanu Gandhi. Another victim was 19 year-old Manu Gandhi, the daughter of his another grand-naphew Joysukhlal Gandhi. After making her a sleeping partner, Gandhi wrote to Joysukhlal that Manu had started to share his bed so that he may "correct her sleeping posture" ( Tidrick, Kathryn (2007). *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*, I.B.Tauris. pp.302–304.).

Gandhi went to Noakhali in December, 1946, and at that time Manu Gandhi was his sleeping partner. He used to say that at that time he was immensely benefitted by lying naked with naked Manu. And it helped him to assess the serious problems like Partition and the Hindu-Muslim amity. Gandhi used to say that he slept with Manu like her mother and Abha and Manu were his walking sticks. It should be mentioned here that at that time, Manu Gandhi was married and

her husband's name was Surendra Mashruwala. In March, 1945, Gandhi told the press reporters that lying with naked Abha and Manu, he achieved great success in his experiment on celibacy. "Previously I carried out similar experiments with Kasturba, but that did not yield so much" ( Tidrick, Kathryn (2007). *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*, I.B.Tauris. pp. 302–304.).

Obviously, Gandhi became the target of bitter criticism, even by his closest companions, due to his sexual perversion in the name of experiments on brahmacharya. One day his stenographer R P Parashuram, observing him lying naked with naked Manu Gandhi, submitted his resignation letter and left the ashram. Gandhi told him that he was at liberty to do whatever he wanted. He could remain at the ashram or go. (Kumar, Girja (1997). *The Book on Trial: Fundamentalism and Censorship in India*, Har-Anand Publishers. pp. 73–107).

Nirmal Kumar Basu was one of the closest associates of Gandhi and accompanied him during his Noakhali tour. There an incident took place on 17th December that turned Nirmal Kumar into a severe critique of Gandhi. On that night Gandhi was sleeping, as usual naked, with Manu Gandhi and Dr Sushila Nair. Sushila was a doctor and accompanied Gandhi to look after his health. Just before dawn, it appeared that something unusual was happening in the room where Gandhi was sleeping with Manu and Sushila. It was found that Gandhi was screaming in shrill voice and slapping his forehead.

Neither Manu nor Sushila had ever disclosed what happened on that fateful night. But it was not so difficult to guess. Most probably, Gandhi made sexual advances to Sushila and tried to rape an unwilling Sushila. She, on the other hand, prevented Gandhi and cried for help and that made Gandhi to scream out of frustration. After this incident, Nirmal Kumar decided to abandon Gandhi and he permanently left him on 18th March, 1947 (Ghose, Sankar (1991). *Mahatma Gandhi*, Allied Publishers. pp. 356, D Keer, p-759 & Yashodhara Roychowdhuri, ibid.).

Later on, Nirmal Kumar expressed his grievances through a letter. He wrote that, perhaps he, lying naked with several naked women, wanted to test whether that aroused his sexual passion. But, in fact, he was ruining the lives of his young women associates. It is a shame that we are still using the word Mahatma before the name of such a sexually pervert debauch. (To learn more, see, **Nakedness, Nonviolence, and Brahmacharya: Gandhi's Experiments in Celibate Sexuality** By Vinay Lal - http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html).

## APPENDIX I
## NATHURAM GODSE – WHY I KILLED GANDHI

Gandhi's Assassin Nathuram Godse's Final Address to the Court. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nathuram_Godse)

Nathuram Godse was arrested immediately after he assassinated Gandhiji, based on a F. I. R. filed by Nandlal Mehta at the Tughlak Road Police staton at Delhi. The trial, which was held in camera, began on 27th May 1948 and concluded on 10th February 1949. He was sentenced to death...

An appeal to the Punjab High Court, then in session at Simla, did not find favour and the sentence was upheld. The statement that you are about to read is the last speech made by Godse before the Court on the 5th of May 1949.

Such was the power and eloquence of this statement that one of the judges, G. D.. Khosla, later wrote, "I have, however, no doubt that had the audience of that day been constituted into a jury and entrusted with the task of deciding Godse's appeal, they would have brought a verdict of 'not Guilty' by an overwhelming majority"

WHY I KILLED GANDHI Born in a devotional Brahmin family, I instinctively came to revere Hindu religion, Hindu history and Hindu culture. I had, therefore, been intensely proud of Hinduism as a whole. As I grew up I developed a tendency to free thinking unfettered by any superstitious allegiance to any isms, political or religious. That is why I worked actively for the eradication of untouchability and the caste system based on birth alone. I openly joined RSS wing of anti-caste movements and maintained that all Hindus were of equal status as to rights, social and religious and should be considered high or low on merit alone and not through the accident of birth in a particular caste or profession.

I used publicly to take part in organized anti-caste dinners in which thousands of Hindus, Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas, Chamars and Bhangis participated. We broke the caste rules and dined in the company of each other. I have read the speeches and writings of Ravana, Chanakiya, Dadabhai Naoroji, Vivekanand, Gokhale, Tilak, along with the books of ancient and modern history of India and some prominent countries like

England, France, America and Russia. Moreover I studied the tenets of Socialism and Marxism. But above all I studied very closely whatever Veer Savarkar and Gandhiji had written and spoken, as to my mind these two ideologies have contributed more to the moulding of the thought and action of the Indian people during the last thirty years or so, than any other single factor has done.

All this reading and thinking led me to believe it was my first duty to serve Hindudom and Hindus both as a patriot and as a world citizen.. To secure the freedom and to safeguard the just interests of some thirty crores (300 million) of Hindus would automatically constitute the freedom and the well-being of all India, one fifth of human race. This conviction led me naturally to devote myself to the Hindu Sanghtanist ideology and programme, which alone, I came to believe, could win and preserve the national independence of Hindustan, my Motherland, and enable her to render true service to humanity as well.

Since the year 1920, that is, after the demise of Lokamanya Tilak, Gandhiji's influence in the Congress first increased and then became supreme. His activities for public awakening were phenomenal in their intensity and were reinforced by the slogan of truth and non-violence which he paraded ostentatiously before the country.. No sensible or enlightened person could object to those slogans. In fact there is nothing new or original in them. They are implicit in every constitutional public movement. But it is nothing but a mere dream if you imagine that the bulk of mankind is, or can ever become, capable of scrupulous adherence to these lofty principles in its normal life from day to day.

In fact, honour, duty and love of one's own kith and kin and country might often compel us to disregard non-violence and to use force. I could never conceive that an armed resistance to an aggression is unjust.. I would consider it a religious and moral duty to resist and, if possible, to overpower such an enemy by use of force. [In the Ramayana] Rama killed Ravana in a tumultuous fight and relieved Sita.. [In the Mahabharata] , Krishna killed Kansa to end his wickedness; and Arjuna had to fight and slay quite a number of his friends and relations including the revered Bhishma because the latter was on the side of the aggressor. It is my firm belief that in dubbing Rama, Krishna and Arjuna as guilty of violence, the Mahatma betrayed a total ignorance of the springs of human action.

In more recent history, it was the heroic fight put up by Chhatrapati Shivaji that first checked and eventually destroyed the Muslim tyranny in India. It was absolutely essentially for Shivaji to overpower and kill an aggressive Afzal Khan, failing which he would have lost his own life.. In condemning history's towering warriors like Shivaji, Rana Pratap and Guru Gobind Singh as misguided patriots, Gandhiji has merely exposed his self-conceit. He was, paradoxical as it may appear, a violent pacifist who brought untold

calamities on the country in the name of truth and non-violence, while Rana Pratap, Shivaji and the Guru will remain enshrined in the hearts of their countrymen for ever for the freedom they brought to them.

The accumulating provocation of thirty-two years, culminating in his last pro-Muslim fast, at last goaded me to the conclusion that the existence of Gandhi should be brought to an end immediately. Gandhi had done very good in South Africa to uphold the rights and well-being of the Indian community there. But when he finally returned to India he developed a subjective mentality under which he alone was to be the final judge of what was right or wrong. If the country wanted his leadership, it had to accept his infallibility; if it did not, he would stand aloof from the Congress and carry on his own way.

Against such an attitude there can be no halfway house. Either Congress had to surrender its will to his and had to be content with playing second fiddle to all his eccentricity, whimsicality, metaphysics and primitive vision, or it had to carry on without him. He alone was the Judge of everyone and every thing; he was the master brain guiding the civil disobedience movement; no other could know the technique of that movement. He alone knew when to begin and when to withdraw it. The movement might succeed or fail, it might bring untold disaster and political reverses but that could make no difference to the Mahatma's infallibility. 'A Satyagrahi can never fail' was his formula for declaring his own infallibility and nobody except himself knew what a Satyagrahi is. Thus, the Mahatma became the judge and jury in his own cause. These childish insanities and obstinacies, coupled with a most severe austerity of life, ceaseless work and lofty character made Gandhi formidable and irresistible.

**Nathuram Vinayak Godse, the Assassinator of Gandhi**

Many people thought that his politics were irrational but they had either to withdraw from the Congress or place their intelligence at his feet to do with as he liked. In a position of such absolute irresponsibility Gandhi was guilty of blunder after blunder, failure after failure, disaster after disaster. Gandhi's pro-Muslim policy is blatantly in his perverse attitude on the question of the national language of India. It is quite obvious that Hindi has the most prior claim to be accepted as the premier language. In the beginning of his career in India, Gandhi gave a great impetus to Hindi but as he found that the Muslims did not like it, he became a champion of what is called Hindustani.. . Everybody in India knows that there is no language called Hindustani; it has no grammar; it has no vocabulary. It is a mere dialect, it is spoken, but not written. It is a bastard tongue and cross-breed between Hindi and Urdu, and not even the Mahatma's sophistry could make it popular. But in his desire to please the Muslims he insisted that Hindustani alone should be the national language of India.

His blind followers, of course, supported him and the so-called hybrid language began to be used.. The charm and purity of the Hindi language was to be prostituted to please the Muslims. All his experiments were at the expense of the Hindus.

From August 1946 onwards the private armies of the Muslim League began a massacre of the Hindus. The then Viceroy, Lord Wavell, though distressed at what was happening, would not use his powers under the Government of India Act of 1935 to prevent the rape, murder and arson. The Hindu blood began to flow from Bengal to Karachi with some retaliation by the Hindus. The Interim Government formed in September was sabotaged by its Muslim League members right from its inception, but the more they became disloyal and treasonable to the government of which they were a part, the greater was Gandhi's infatuation for them. Lord Wavell had to resign as he could not bring about a settlement and he was succeeded by Lord Mountbatten. King Log was followed by King Stork. The Congress which had boasted of its nationalism and socialism secretly accepted Pakistan literally at the point of the bayonet and abjectly surrendered to Jinnah. India was vivisected and one-third of the Indian territory became foreign land to us from August 15, 1947.

Lord Mountbatten came to be described in Congress circles as the greatest Viceroy and Governor-General this country ever had. The official date for handing over power was fixed for June 30, 1948, but Mountbatten with his ruthless surgery gave us a gift of vivisected India ten months in advance. This is what Gandhi had achieved after thirty years of undisputed dictatorship and this is what Congress party calls 'freedom' and 'peaceful transfer of power'. The Hindu-Muslim unity bubble was finally burst and a theocratic state was established with the consent of Nehru and his crowd and they have called 'freedom won by them with sacrifice' - whose sacrifice? When top leaders of Congress, with the consent of Gandhi, divided and tore the country - which we consider a deity of worship - my mind was filled with direful anger.

One of the conditions imposed by Gandhi for his breaking of the fast unto death related to the mosques in Delhi occupied by the Hindu refugees. But when Hindus in Pakistan were subjected to violent attacks he did not so much as utter a single word to protest and censure the Pakistan Government or the Muslims concerned. Gandhi was shrewd enough to know that while undertaking a fast unto death, had he imposed for its break some condition on the Muslims in Pakistan, there would have been found hardly any Muslims who could have shown some grief if the fast had ended in his death. It was for this reason that he purposely avoided imposing any condition on the Muslims. He was fully aware of from the experience that Jinnah was not at all perturbed or influenced by his fast and the Muslim League hardly attached any value to the inner voice of Gandhi. Gandhi is being referred to as the Father of the Nation.

But if that is so, he had failed his paternal duty inasmuch as he has acted very treacherously to the nation by his consenting to the partitioning of it. I stoutly maintain that Gandhi has failed in his duty. He has proved to be the Father of Pakistan. His inner-voice, his spiritual power and his doctrine of non-violence of which so much is made of, all crumbled before Jinnah's iron will and proved to be powerless.. Briefly speaking, I thought to myself and foresaw I shall be totally ruined, and the only thing I could expect from the people would be nothing but hatred and that I shall have lost all my honour, even more valuable than my life, if I were to kill Gandhiji. But at the same time I felt that the Indian politics in the absence of Gandhiji would surely be proved practical, able to retaliate, and would be powerful with armed forces. No doubt, my own future would be totally ruined, but the nation would be saved from the inroads of Pakistan. People may even call me and dub me as devoid of any sense or foolish, but the nation would be free to follow the course founded on the reason which I consider to be necessary for sound nation-building.

After having fully considered the question, I took the final decision in the matter, but I did not speak about it to anyone whatsoever. I took courage in both my hands and I did fire the shots at Gandhiji on 30th January 1948, on the prayer-grounds of Birla House. I do say that my shots were fired at the person whose policy and action had brought rack and ruin and destruction to millions of Hindus. There was no legal machinery by which such an offender could be brought to book and for this reason I fired those fatal shots. I bear no ill will towards anyone individually but I do say that I had no respect for the present government owing to their policy which was unfairly favourable towards the Muslims. But at the same time I could clearly see that the policy was entirely due to the presence of Gandhi.

I have to say with great regret that Prime Minister Nehru quite forgets that his preachings and deeds are at times at variances with each other when he talks about India as a secular state in season and out of season, because it is significant to note that Nehru has played a leading role in the establishment of the theocratic state of Pakistan, and his job was made easier by Gandhi's persistent policy of appeasement towards the Muslims. I now stand before the court to accept the full share of my responsibility for what I have done and the judge would, of course, pass against me such orders of sentence as may be considered proper. But I would like to add that I do not desire any mercy to be shown to me, nor do I wish that anyone else should beg for mercy on my behalf. My confidence about the moral side of my action has not been shaken even by the criticism levelled against it on all sides. I have no doubt that honest writers of history will weigh my act and find the true value thereof some day in future. JAI HIND. (From: VijayKapur v.kapur@rediffmail.com)

(Watch video - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZHVS6Xw9okg)

## APPENDIX II
## GANDHI DID NOT SAY "HEY RAM" WHILE DYING :

The followers of Gandhi and his nonviolence creed have widely publicized that Gandhi said "Hey Ram" when fell to the bullets of Nathuram Godse. But according to a report appeared on January 31, 2006, in the reputed English daily TIMES OF INDIA said that he did not say a word when falling to the bullets of Nathuram Godse. The report read, "KOLLAM (KERALA): Mahatma Gandhi did not utter "Hey Ram" when he fell to the bullets of an assassin 58 years ago as has been famously attributed to the Father of the Nation, his personal attendant says. "Gandhi did not say 'Hey Ram'. In fact, he did not utter any word when the bullets fired from Nathuram Godse's pistol pierced his chest," Bapu's personal assistant Venkita Kalyanam who claims to be a witness to the horrific event told a news conference on Sunday." The same report appeared also in the ECONOMIC TIMES, on the same day. Gandhi after assassinated by Godse.

## APPENDIX III
## GANDHI DID NOT GET THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE :

Although he was nominated five times between 1937 and 1948, including the first-ever nomination by the American Friends Service Committee. Decades later, the Nobel Committee publicly declared its regret for the omission, and admitted to deeply divided nationalistic opinion denying the award. Mahatma Gandhi was to receive the Prize in 1948, but his assassination prevented the award. The war breaking out between the newly created states of India and Pakistan could have been an additional complicating factor that year. The Prize was not awarded in 1948, the year of Gandhi's death, on the grounds that "there was no suitable living candidate" that year, and when the Dalai Lama was awarded the Prize in 1989, the chairman of the committee said that this was "in part a tribute to the memory of Mahatma Gandhi." (Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia).

As a matter of fact, the Nobel Committee saved the sanctity and dignity of the Nobel Peace Prize by refusing to deliver it to Gandhi. It is expected that the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize should be a man of high moral standard – a man of dignity and respect and certainly not a loathsome antinational and loyal stooge of an imperialist colonial power like Gandhi.

## APPENDIX IV
## GANDHI INDEX :

***Mahatma Gandhi*** by Shri Dhanjay Keer is considered as the best biography on Gandhi. The book contains 820 pages and hence is difficult

to read by the busy readers. This author has therefore made a summary of facts narrated in the book as GANDHI INDEX, so that common readers may have an idea of Gandhi's life and deeds. It may help the readers forming a personal opinion on Gandhi, ***Mahatma Gandhi*** *By Dhananjay Keer*

1. Spent 21 years in South Africa
2. Earned about Rs 40,000 per year in SA.
3. Blood group (1927)...188, 484.
4. Height 5' 5".
5. Weight 114 lbs in 1922.
6. Passed Matriculation in 3rd division...11
7. Left Bombay for London, 4.9.1888...14
8. Reached London on 28.10.1888...15
9. Spent Rs 13,000 during his stay in London...23
10. Went to SA to fight a case of Dada Abdulla & Co, against Tyab Haji Khan Muhammad... 28
11. Appointed as a lawyer by A. K. Zaveri...32
12. Vedas, Koran and Bible are inspired...41
13. Returned to India from SA on 4.7.1896...51
14. Left Bombay for SA again on 30.11.1896...56
15. Thrashed by the whites in SA...60
16. **Loyal Gandhi sings British National Anthem**...62
17. **Boer War, G forms an ambulance corps, 1100 strong, G goes to War front in Dec. 1899**...65
18. **Expresses utmost loyalty to the Br Crown**...65, 520
19. **Br Empire for the welfare of the world**...66
20. **Br presents gold medal for his service to the empire**...66
21. **G expresses loyalty to the Br on the death of Queen Victoria**...67
22. Meets Acharya P. C. Roy in Calcutta...70
23. G returns to SA on 20.11.1902...73
24. Indian Opinion, a bulletin, founded...75
25. Starts brahmacharya (celibacy) in 1903...77
26. Influenced by the writings of Ruskin...80-83
27. Studies Islam and Hinduism...87-88
28. Meets Bhai Paramand...89
29. Influenced by writings of Tolstoy and Gorky...90-91

    Supports Partition of Bengal and repudiates nationalist leaders for opposing the Br plan...91
30. **Helps Br during Zulu Rebellion and presented gold medal by the Br for his support**...98

31. Further description on brahmacharya...98
32. Interested to translate 'Spirit of Islam' by Syed Amir Ali...109
33. **Expresses deep loyalty to Br on the day of coronation of the king George-V**...185,218,220,239,253,262
34. His ideas about morality...110
35. Hindus are lazy and cowerd...115, 130
36. Wanted to translate a book on Life of Muhammad in Gujarati...117
37. Influenced by the writings of Thoreu and comments on him...119-120, 225
38. Meets Veer Savarkar...121-122
39. On SATYAGRAHA...122, 142
40. Reads Gita and Koran while in jail...125
41. Afghan Mir Alam beats G severely...127-129
    Denies English education to his son...132,159,160
42. **Deplores Khudiram and other freedom fighters and condemns violence**...135
43. **Condemns Bal Gangadhar Tilak**...136
44. **British Raj was good for India**...138
45. False promise of SWARAJ WITHIN A YEAR...139, 336
46. *MAHABHARATA* is a true story, praises Draupadi...144
47. Prahlada was a real Satyagrahi...144
48. On Swami Dayananda Saraswati...145
49. Discards sacred thread and shikha...145
50. Islam or any evil should be fought with good...147
51. Hindus should give everything to the Muslims...150
52. No swaraj without Hindu-Muslim unity...150
53. Travels in the First class in a ship...151
54. Every Hindu should learn Sanskrit...151
55. **Condemns Madan Lal Dhingra for violence**...152
56. **Supports violence committed by the British**...155
57. **Condemns SAVARKAR for supporting Dhingra**...155, 157, 168
58. **Satyagraha not to hurt Br or it does not hurt Br.**...158
59. Biography of Gandhi written by Rev. Joseph...158
60. **Why Br chose G for leading the Freedom Movement**...159
61. Writes letter to Tolstoy...161
62. Makes self propaganda through the biography...163
63. Denies slaying of Ravana by Lord Ram...165
64. British Parliament is a PROSTITUTE...169
65. Ignorance of ISLAM or failed to understand Islam...170
66. His ignorance of history...170, 172, 217
67. Condemns Western system of medicine and hospital...171, 376

68. Takes help of Western system of medicine to cure himself...278, 279(piles), 430, 438, 474.
69. One should give everything to a robber...172
70. Condemns machines and industry...172
71. On non-killing of animals...175
72. Comments by BRIJ Narain on Gandhi...176
73. Takes un-cooked food and fruits...181
74. **Gokhale goes to SA and asks G to return to India**...188-190
75. **Condemns Biplabi Rashbehari Bose**...190
76. Swami Shraddhanda- victim of Islamic barbarism...199
77. Among Rama, Krishna and Buddha, Buddha was the greatest...202
78. Returns to India via London*...203-206
79. Struggles and compromises...207
80. Arrives Bombay (via London) on 9.1.1915...208
81. **Promises Governor of Bombay to abide by his instructions**...211
82. Addressed MAHATMA for the first time...212
83. Changes his dress and on dress code...214, 549
84. Gokhale predicts G's absolute leadership in Freedom Movement...215
85. Meets Tagore...216
86. Four MAHATMAs...218
87. Railway is an evil...220
88. Kaiser-i-Hind medal awarded...225, 226, 249
89. Servants of India Society rejects G's application...231
90. **Revolutionaries are anarchists**...232-233
91. **.G's views pleases British**...234
92. 500 revolutionaries butchered in Punjab...235
93. India is a country of nonsense...236
94. GANDHI A MOHMEDAN, says HAJI MOHAMMAD...237
95. Vaccination is a sin , similar to eating beef...237
96. Praises the Br for giving the message of NON-VIOLENCE...238
97. Lala Lajpat Rai explains AHIMSA ...240
98. Ambedkar on Ahimsa, and his criticism of G..241, 449, 450, 453
99. Foreign authors on G's doctrine of non-violence...241
100. Bogus economic ideas of G..242
101. G double speaks on Urdu...245
102. **Assures Br that he would never adopt violent means**...253
103. Hindus should die but never should kill a Muslim...258
104. Writes to Br to set Ali Brothers free...262, 272, 283
105. **Recruits soldiers for Br to fight in World War-I**...273, 274, 277

106. Praises Br for its taking part in World War-I...273
107. **There is no need to end Br rule in India**...274
108. Speaks in favour of using arms and violence...274
109. **Protection of British Raj is necessary for the interest of Swaraj***...275
110. G's name recommended for NOBEL PRIZE...593, 436
111. **Jallanwala Bagh massacre**...290-292
112. On hand woven cloth (khaddar)...295
113. G opposed in Maharastra...296
114. Swami Sraddhananda opposes the doctrine of SATYAGRAHA...297
115. SATYAGRAHA resulted into more killing of innocent men...298
116. G supports the KHILAFAT MOVEMENT...302-303, 310-311
117. Ali brothers released...304
118. Gandhi versus Tilak...307-309, 310-312
119. Gandhi more pro-Muslim than Jinnah...317
120. G pleads for Hindustani i.e. Urdu...316
121. G a politician trying to become a saint...320-321
122. Indian Muslims should welcome invasion of India by the Afghans...323
123. **Tilak denounces G's policies**...326-327
124. G gives call to the Muslims to rise...329
125. Death of Tilak, the main enemy of G (in 1920)...329
126. Asks students to boycott schools and to spin thread with spinning wheel...330
127. Admits that Gita preached violence for good...331
128. G advocates violence...333
129. Violence is the law of brutes...333
130. India should not take up arms...333
131. KHILAFAT cause is greater than SWARAJ...337
132. Br won India from the Hindus, says a British...340
133. ALLAH HO AKBAR is a national slogan...342
134. Keeps mum when a Muslim murders an European...343
135. Silent about crimes committed by Muslims...344
136. Admits that Koran does not teach Hindu-Muslim unity...347
137. Br rule is SATANIK, RAVAN rajya and Godless Empire...351-353
138. Gandhian Swaraj is mystical...355, 372, 415
139. G on caste system...358-362
140. **Jinnah refuses to call Gandhi a mahatma**...365
141. C. R. Das turns into a follower of G...367
142. G on violent verses of the Koran...367-368
143. S. A. Dange refutes G...369
144. Advises BENGALI YOUTH and students to adopt Satyagraha...370-371

145. Swaraj within a year or death...371
146. Gokhale the guru and the INNER VOICE...375
147. New class of patriots having blind faith in Gandhian policy...377
148. **G raises a fund of Rs 1 crore, mainly from the Parsees**...378
149. Spends crores on political campaign...379
150. G opposes creation of Israel...380
151. Call to raise Rs 1 crore, 1 crore members & 20 lakh spinning wheels...380, 396
152. New National Flag, Tri colour (red, white & green) with charka in 1917...381
153. **People, who MADE GANDHI GREAT**...384-385
154. G criticized...386-388
155. Advises Indian Muslims to ASSIST the Amir of Afghanistan if he INVADES INDIA...388
156. Advises Muslims to be violent...389
157. G promises help to Amir of Afghanistan, announces publicly...390-391, 393
158. Asks AMIR not to make peace with INDIA...391
159. He is to create history but not to READ HISTORY...391
160. Sir JADUNATH SARKAR on ISLAMIC JIHAD...391
161. Ambedkar's criticism of Gandhi...394, 564
162. MOPLA REVOLT & MASSACRE OF HINDUS...401-402
163. Criticism of TAGORE on Gandhi...403-404, 470
164. SARAT CHATTERJI on G...404,
165. GANDHI versus TAGORE...405
166. TAGORE ridicules G...591
167. Gandhi described as an INCARNATION OF KRISHNA...406.
168. G SHAVES HEAD, discards cap, adopts a new DRESS...407, 413
169. Ali Brothers arrested, G declares self immolation...409
172. **WAS GANDHI A MAHATMA ?**...409
173. **Prince of Wales arrives on 17.11.1921**...410
174. BOSE and C R DAS deplores G...412
175. Gandhi, the DICTATOR OF CONGRESS...414
176. **Demand of INDEPENDENCE is DENIAL OF GOD**...415
177. **G opposes independence**...416
178. **G blames Andrews for demanding INDEPENDENCE**...416
179. **G's confession that HE DID NOT WORKED FOR INDEPENDENCE**...416
180. Violence at CHAURI CHARA and etc...418-419.
181. And the role of his INNER VOICE...420
182. **Arrest of Gandhi- An intrigue between GANDHI & BRITISH**...421
183. G sentenced to 6 years in prison...422
184. GOAT MILK & DAILY RATION in jail...426-427, 555

185. READS KORAN in jail...428
186. Miss BLANCE WATSON on Gandhi...429
187. COMMUNISTS ON Gandhi...429
188. Released from jail after 2 years...432
189. **Jail was a REWARD FOR LOYALTY TO British**...432
190. 21 Shikhs die out of police firing on 21.2.1924...437
191. SWAMI SHRADDHANANDA and the MUSLIMS...439
192. G INFERIOR than a FALLEN MUSLIM & FALLEN Christian...440
193. G's mishandling of Rs 1 crore fund...441
194. G on Buddhism, Jainism, Aurobinda and GITA...442-443, 742
195. G's Biography by ROMAIN ROLLAND...444
196. MUSLIMS are BULLIS and HINDUS are COWARDS...445
197. G inspires MUSLIMS to ATTACK the HINDUS...445
198. Hindus should not defend the attacks by the Muslims...445
199. G critical of SUDDHI but silent on TABLIGH...446
200. Delpores RANGILA RASUL but silent on SATOKA CHHINAL...447
201. Asks Hindus to STOP PHYSICAL EXERCISE & DISTURB the MUSLIMS...448, 462
202. Veer Savarkar deplores G's non-violence...448
203. G asks Hindus not to follow SAVARKAR...449
204. GREAT DEFEAT OF GANDHI...452
205. AICC REJECTS GANDHI's NON-VIOLENCE...454
206. G opposes Compulsory PRIMARY EDUCATION...455
207. M N ROY criticizes Gandhi...456, 544
208. Poona Conference REJECTS CHARKHA...456
209. Hindu-Muslim RIOT in Kohat, Punjab; Muslims killed Hindus. G asked Hindus not to kill Mus...457
210. G proposes SWARAJ within BRITISH EMPIRE...459
211. People rejects Gandhi, but BRITISH TRIES TO PUSH HIM UP...460
212. SWARAJ does not mean END OF BRITISH RAJ...461
213. By his DRESS, G wanted to show that he was the POOREST of the POORS ...464, 480
214. But he lived like a RICH MAN...464
215. Rana Pratap, Shivaji etc. were MISGUIDED PATRIOTS...465
216. J L N's apology for G's comment on SHIVAJI...466
217. Spoils Freedom Movement in Bengal...466
218. America helps G to regain his position in the Congress...472
219. **GANDHI would KISS the FEET of the MUSLIM VIOLATOR of his sister** ...473
220. What G would have done had he been the EMPEROR OF INDIA ...476
221. Gandhi OPPOSES BIRTH CONTROL...478

222. ABDUL RASHID, the killer of Swami Shraddhananda, is G's BROTHER...479
223. Muslims hail ABDUL RASHID...480
224. Famous RATNAGIRI ADDRESS...481-482
225. G meets Viceroy LORD IRWIN...490
226. Opposes JNL's proposal for complete FREEDOM...492
227. Opposes call for INDEPENDENCE by the MADRAS Congress...493-494
228. **Proves that he was a BRITISH AGENT**...501
229. Gandhi ANNOUNCES HIS DEATH on 27th March, 1928...495
230. Tolstoy, Ruskin and Gokhale, THREE GURUS of Gandhi...496
231. Advises to KILL MONKEYS...499
232. Death of LAJPAT RAI due to lathi-charge by the police...499
233. G wanted DOMINION STATUS...500
234. Lord IRWIN promises DOMINION STATUS...511
235. G CONFUSED people by the word SWARAJ...501
236. Bose's proposal for Independence defeated...501
237. Gandhi says that SWARAJ is INDEPENDENCE...515
238. Gandhi burns and boycotts foreign cloth...504-505
239. Gandhi praises ISLAM and denounces CHRISTIANITY...505
240. Denounces revolutionary violent struggle by the YOUTH OF ANDHRA...506
241. Violence increases SPENDINGS OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT...506
242. G deplores RAJPAL, the author of 'RANGILA RASUL'...507
243. G writes a commentary on GITA in 1929...507
244. **GANDHI COMPARED WITH A COW**...508
245. Gandhi collects HUGE MONEY...510
246. **Congress promises COOPERATION WITH BRITISH CROWN**...512
247. G's autobiography published in October, 1929 ...512
248. Shooting on Viceroy's train in Mysore, G leaves Wardha to meet Viceroy...513
249. Gandhi fasts for the violence .....513
250. **G drops SUBHAS BOSE from CONGRESS WORKING COMMITTEE**...515
251. Gandhi astonishes J L Nehru...518
252. **G SUPPORTS the Independence proposal to GAIN CONTROL over CONGRESS...519**
253. REJECTS the Independence proposal on the BEHEST of the VICEROY...519
254. **G diverted FREEDOM STRUGGLE to struggle for SALT TAX and DANDI yatra**...520
255. G's unwavering LOYALTY to BRITISH CROWN...520
256. **G admits that his NON-VIOLENCE is a SAFETY VALVE**...521
257. JAIL GOING of Gandhi was a SAFETY VALVE...525
258. **LUXURIOUS LIVING OF Gandhi in JAIL**...529, 531
259. Luxurious living of M. L. NEHRU IN JAIL...530

260. Round Table Conference...532, 533
261. GANDHI described as a CAPRICIOUS WOMAN...537
262. **A comparison of GANDHI AND SAVARKAR in JAIL**...531
263. Basically, GANDHI was a BENIA...537
264. **WINSTON CHURCHILL on GANDHI**...538
265. Gopal Krishna GOKHALE on GANDHI...541
266. RAJAJI on GANDHI...542
267. REVOLUTIONARIES and PATRIOTS reject GANDHI...541
268. Execution of BHAGAT SINGH and comments of Gandhi...543
269. SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS against Gandhi...545
270. G misinterprets INDIAN CULTURE...546
271. Gandhi's IGNORANCE about ECONOMIC MATTERS...555
272. **CHARLIE CHAPLIN on GANDHI**...556
273. Mc DONALD on GANDHI...559
274. AGHA KHAN on GANDHI...559
275. Gandhi draws 5,000 as ROYALTY from HMV...560.
276. AMBEDKAR on GANDHI...564
277. **GANDHI a FRIEND of BRITISH**...565
278. BRITISH MAKES A BUST OF GANDHI...565
279. Word HARIJAN was used for the FIRST TIME by NARSI MEHTA...581
280. REAL STORY behind FASTING by GANDHI...583
281. G FASTS according to the call of the INNER VOICE...584
282. SHRI AUROBINDA on GANDHI...586
283. **SHRI AUROBINDA refuses to SEE GANDHI**...592
284. G moves to WARDHA ashram...588
285. GANDHI raises FUNDS for the HARIJANS...588-589
286. **TAGORE and SAVARKAR ridicule Gandhi**...591
287. Gandhi on EARTHQUACK...591, 610
288. **BOMB ATTACK on Gandhi**...596
289. 12,500 miles HARIJAN TOUR...596-598
290. Gandhi APPROVES FIGHT against MUSLIMS...610
291. Gandhi ON CONVERSION...611
292. Gandhi on SEX and BIRTH CONTROL...615
293. G a trustee of SANTINIKETAN and donates Rs 40,000...620
294. Gandhi's son EMBRACES ISLAM...622
295. Gandhi on GITA...625, 657
296. TROTSKY criticizes Gandhi...629
297. **MARRIAGE OF MANU GANDHI**...632
298. Gandhi on SAVARKAR...635

299. RAHUL Sankritayan on Gandhi...641
300. Subhas BOSE APPREHENDED PARTITION OF INDIA...643
301. **G did not enter the PURI TEMPLE**...645
302. Congress DISCARDS NON-VIOLENCE...645, 646
303. Gandhi MEETS Viceroy LINLITHGO...646
304. **J. L. Nehru's comment on VANDE MATARAM**...93, 647
305. INNER VOICE OF KHARE ...649
306. Ruthless SUPPRESSION of KHARE by Gandhi...649-651
307. Gandhi approves VIOLENCE BY THE PATHANS...655
308. Gandhi on NAZIs and the JEWs...655
309. **H. G. WELLS on GANDHI**...656
310. GANDHI Versus SUBHAS BOSE...658-663
311. Gandhi Takes REVENGE ON BOSE....664
312. G's VIOLENCE on BOSE, BOSE forms FORWARD BLOC...665, 669
313. **Gandhi prohibits singing VANDE MATARAM**...668
314. World War – II begins on 3.9.1939; Br declares war against GERMANY...670
315. GANDHI grieved for a POSSIBLE DESTRUCTION OF LONDON...670
316. G to assist the British without any PRE-CONDITION...671
317. **India should not wage a WAR even for protecting BORDERS for the sake of AHIMSA**...673
318. **Only INDIA and Only HINDUS should practice NON-VIOLENCE**...673, 680
319. **HINDUS should not join the ARMY for the sake of NON-VIOLENCE**...674
320. RIOT in SINDH; Gandhi prescribes NON-VIOLENCE for the HINDU victims...674-675
321. G. D. BIRLA, closest businessman of Gandhi...676
322. Segaon in CP renamed SEVAGRAM on 26.1.1940 (should have been 'Lunatic Asylum'...676-677
323. **SHOE THROWN AT GANDHI**...677
324. **GANDHI AND SEX**...677-679, 755-756
325. **..do.., as narrated by N. K. BOSE**...759-760
326. UDHAM SINGH kills M. O'Dwyer...679
327. Muslim League Demands PARTITION at LAHORE SESSION on 26.3.1940...681
328. Gandhi OKAYS creation of PAKISTAN...681
329. Gandhi prefers MUSLIM RULE to BRITISH RULE...683
330. G vows to assist British in World War-II; CONGRESS discards GANDHISM ...684
331. G requests British to remain NON-VIOLENT against GERMANY...685
332. Gandhi prefers MUSLIM EMPEROR for INDIA; SAVARKAR reacts...690
333. BOSE SURRENDERS to Gandhi, but GANDHI DECLINES...691-692

334. Death of TAGORE on 8.8.1941...693
335. G's WRITINGS ON PARTITION in Harijan...701
336. G's COMMENT on BOSE & INA...704
337. **G requests BRITISH to HANDOVER POWER to MUSLIMS**...708
338. G at AGHA KHAN'S PALACE...709
339. G allows VIOLENCE in QUIT INDIA movement...711
340. G meets VICEROY LINLITHGO after QUIT INDIA movement...714
341. G and RAJAJI's conspiracy for PAKISTAN...716
342. G incites VIOLENCE through writings in HARIJAN...719, 724-728
343. PARNA KUTIR of G...719
344. **KASTURVA's death on 22.2.1944**...720
345. TREACHERY of Gandhi on PARTITION...724
346. G shown BLACK FLAG...725
347. PRO PAKISTAN ROLE of the COMMUNISTS...725
348. **L. G. THATTE's ATTEMPT to KILL G**...726
349. G meets JINNAH and JINNAH rejects the proposal for MOTH eaten PAK...726
350. G PAYS 19 visits to JINNAH...727
351. Viceroy LINLITHGO DISCARDS the idea of PAKISTAN...727
352. **BOSE Describes GANDHI as the FATHER OF THE NATION**...729
353. G raises a fund of Rs 80 LAKH for KASTURVA's MEMORIAL Fund of Rs 1,24,00,000...729,731
354. G's TREACHERY with BHANUBHAI DESAI...733-734
355. Trial of INA benefits the CONGRESS...737
356. **G pleads for HINDUSTANI (URDU) to be the NATIONAL LANGUAGE** ...739
357. G WEIGHED with SILVER...739
358. FISH EATING not VIOLENCE...741
359. JINNAH deplores GANDHI and his DOCTRINE...744
360. G on NUCLEAR BOMB...746
361. **DIRECT ACTION IN CALCUTTA and NOAKHALI**...748-749
362. **HINDUS should allow MUSLIMS to CUT THEM DOWN**...751
363. BIHAR observes NOAKHALI DAY...752
364. **US MEDIA describes G and his policy a FAILURE**...754
365. DAILY MENU OF G...756
366. **G rejects EXCHANGE OF POPULATION**...757
367. **G condemns PATEL for advising HINDUS to SAVE their LIVES**...758
368. G RUSHES to BIHAR to save the MUSLIMS...759
369. **Many calls him MUHAMMAD GANDHI**...762
370. G tried for a UNITED BENGAL, the plot hatched by SURAWARDI...763
371. Lord MOUNTBATTEN returned to LONDON as G ADMITS PARTITION...764

372. **G explains Why he did not DEFEND PARTITION**...765
373. G and JLN's plan to DE-HINDUISE INDIA...765
374. WHY INDIA, not HINDUSTAN...765
375. MAULANA AZAD SUPPORTS PAKISTAN...766
376. **G's speech for PAKISTAN on 14th June, 1946**...766
377. G's movement started with KHILAFAT and ENDS with PAKISTAN...767
378. AMBEDKAR suggests EXCHANGE OF POPULATION...768
379. BRITISH admits THREE REASONS for INDIA'S FREEDOM...768
380. GANDHISM falsified and NEGATIVED...769
381. **G pleads for a DEFENCELESS and ARMYLESS India**...769
382. G deplores TRI-COLOUR National Flag...769
383. **BOMB Thrown at GANDHI & STOPS singing RAMDHUN**...770
384. G was to live in PAKISTAN...770
385. **MASSACRING of HINDUS in W. PUNJAB, G asks HINDUS not REACT**...769-770, 772
386. TANDON deplores GANDHISM...776
387. MEDIA admits FAILURE of GANDHISM, People's REACTION...776
388. PATEL asks MUSLIMS to leave INDIA...776